

Doctoral Dissertation

博士論文

Aspects of critical $O(N)$ model with boundary and defect

(境界や欠陥を持つ臨界 $O(N)$ 模型の諸相)

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on December 2023

令和5年12月 博士 (理学) 申請

Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, University of Tokyo

東京大学 大学院 理学系研究科 物理学専攻

Yoshitaka Okuyama

奥山 義隆

arXiv:2401.15336v1 [hep-th] 27 Jan 2024

Abstract

In this thesis, we explore the critical phenomena in the presence of extended objects, which we call *defects*, aiming for a better understanding of the properties of non-local objects ubiquitous in our world and a more practical and realistic study of criticality. To this end, we study the statistical $O(N)$ vector model in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions with three kinds of defects: a line defect constructed by smearing an $O(N)$ vector field along one direction and Dirichlet and Neumann boundaries. A conventional approach to critical phenomena would be to perform perturbative calculations using Feynman diagrams and doing renormalization group analysis. But we here also take a different but complementary approach based on three axioms that include conformal symmetry of the theory at the criticality. We apply this axiomatic framework to the critical $O(N)$ model with a defect and reproduce the perturbative results at the leading non-trivial order in ϵ , substantiating the validity of our approach. Along the way, we develop and refine the axiomatic framework to derive anomalous dimensions of the composite operators on the defect that have not been accessible in the existing literature by focusing on the analyticity of the correlation functions.

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Foundations of conformal symmetry without defects	13
2.1	Conformal transformation and conformal algebra	13
2.2	Local operators in conformal field theory	14
2.3	Path integral in quantum field theory	16
2.4	Path integral in conformal field theory	19
2.5	State/operator correspondence	21
2.6	Operator Product Expansion	23
2.7	Correlation functions	25
3	Elements of Defect Conformal Field Theory	31
3.1	Defect conformal symmetry	32
3.2	Bulk and defect local primaries	33
3.3	Radial quantization revisited	35
3.4	Correlation functions	38
3.5	Defect Operator Expansion of bulk scalar primary	44
3.6	Defect Operator Expansion spectrum of free scalar field	45
4	Review of Rychkov-Tan’s approach to critical phenomena	49
4.1	Critical $O(N)$ vector model without defects	49
4.2	Axioms for homogeneous critical systems	52
4.3	Axioms in the presence of a defect	56
5	The $O(N)$ model with line defect	59
5.1	Review of perturbative results	59
5.2	Structure of free $O(N)$ model in four dimensions with a line defect	62
5.2.1	Correlation functions	63
5.2.2	Defect operator expansions	66
5.3	DCFT data on the line defect	67

5.3.1	Lowest-lying defect local operator and critical defect coupling	68
5.3.2	Defect local operators with transverse spin indices	69
5.3.3	Composite defect local operators	70
5.4	Defect operator spectrum for $N = 1$ (Ising DCFT)	73
6	The $O(N)$ model with Neumann boundary	77
6.1	Structure of free $O(N)$ model with Neumann boundary	79
6.1.1	Correlation functions	79
6.1.2	Boundary operator expansions in four dimensions	81
6.2	Standard perturbative approach	82
6.3	Axiomatic approach	86
6.3.1	Lowest-lying boundary local operator	86
6.3.2	Boundary composite operators	87
7	The $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet boundary	91
7.1	Structure of free $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet boundary	92
7.1.1	Correlation functions	92
7.1.2	Boundary operator expansions in four dimensions	94
7.2	Standard perturbative approach	95
7.3	Axiomatic approach	97
7.3.1	Lowest-lying boundary local operator	97
7.3.2	Boundary composite operators	97
8	Conclusion	101
A	Useful identities	107
B	A review of unitarity bound	111
B.1	Remarks on analytic properties of correlation functions in quantum field theory	112
B.2	Harmonic function and symmetric traceless tensor	115
B.3	Decomposition of $SO(1, d - 1)$ symmetric and traceless projector	116
B.4	Fourier transformation of two-point Wightman distributions	119
B.5	Unitarity bound from Wightman positivity	123
C	Conformal block expansion of bulk-defect-defect three-point function	127
C.1	Derivation using Defect Operator Expansion	127
C.2	Derivation from Casimir equation	130

Chapter 1

Introduction

Critical phenomena have been one of the central subjects in science since the first discovery by Andrews in 1869, who observed critical opalescence of the carbon dioxide at about 31°C and 73atm . Thanks to their enriched properties, they have been a pivotal milestone in extending the horizon of and bridging across different branches of physics, ranging from condensed matter to statistical physics, particle physics, and string theory.

The critical opalescence at the second-order phase transition, which Andrews observed, is due to the fluctuations at all scales allowed by the container and the lack of the typical length scale of the system. This scale invariance of critical phenomena was made clear theoretically in going through Onsager's exact solution of two-dimensional statistical Ising model [Ons44] and Wilson's renormalization group (RG) studies of critical phenomena [WK74, WF72] where all beta functions vanish on the RG fixed point and the theory becomes scale invariant. The other notable feature of the critical phenomena is the power-law behaviors of physical observables near critical points, such as specific heat and magnetization of magnets. Their exponents, called critical exponents, are insensitive to the microscopic details of the system. Many systems, which have different microscopic descriptions, tend to fall into the same universality class at criticality, as is implied by Wilson's RG analysis. These insights have opened the way to study the critical phenomena of magnets through the ϕ^4 -model of Euclidean Quantum Field Theory (QFT), or statistical field theory.

Polyakov proposed in [Pol70] that one can use conformal invariance, a local version of scale invariance, as a guiding principle to investigate critical phenomena.¹ Conformally invariant Quantum Field Theory is called Conformal Field Theory (CFT) and has led to the success of the field theoretical study of two-dimensional critical phenomena by the authors of [Zam86] making full

¹In many models, one expects the enhancement from scale invariance to conformal invariance. There are many arguments on the differences between scale and conformal invariance. See [Nak13] and references therein for details on this point. The conformal invariance of the critical Ising model is very plausible but not shown rigorously except in two dimensions [Smi07].

use of the infinite-dimensional conformal symmetry in two dimensions. There had been less progress for years in three or more dimensions where, unlike two-dimensional spacetime, the conformal symmetry is finite-dimensional. However, the authors of [RRTV08] revived the conformal bootstrap program [Mac77b, FGG73, Pol74] and made possible the numerical studies of crossing equations of conformal four-point functions. Afterward, we have seen significant numerical and analytical progress, prompting more precise theoretical prediction of critical exponents than ever down to the fifth or sixth decimal place (see [PRV18] and references therein).

For more detailed tests of theoretical prediction to experimental data, one cannot ignore the finite size effect due to the container, impurity, and other extended objects, which we call defects [A⁺18]. Defect Conformal Field Theory (DCFT) is a framework to study critical phenomena in the presence of a defect [BGLM16, Gad16]. We may particularly call Boundary Conformal Field Theory (BCFT) in the case of a boundary. In DCFT, we first make the planer or spherical approximation of the defect. The validity of this approximation comes from the insensitivity of critical phenomena to the microscopic structure of the system. One can always utilize conformal transformation to make a spherical defect into a planer shape (up to Weyl factors). Hence, it is often the case that one only considers planer defects, and so do we in this thesis. The defect at criticality partially breaks the conformal symmetry down to its subgroup and seems to lessen the predictivity of the theory. But they make the structure of the critical systems more amusing. First of all, for each bulk universal class, there exist several defect universality classes, making the phase diagram richer. Correspondingly, critical exponents and operator spectrum on the defect are generically different from those in the bulk. Moreover, two-point functions of bulk fields in DCFT already depend on cross ratios and contain model-dependent information of bulk CFTs, unlike ordinary CFTs where dynamical dependence comes in from four- and higher-point functions.

The other motivation to study DCFT is to grasp and classify extended objects that have played pivotal roles in physics, such as Wilson and 't Hooft operators serving as probes of confinement in gauge theories [Wil74, tH78], spin impurities that drive the Kondo effect [Kon64, Wil75, Aff95], and D-branes in string theory [DLP89, Hor89]. As DCFTs lie at the endpoints of the RG flow of QFTs with extended objects, uncovering the structure of DCFTs leads to the classification of non-local objects in general QFTs in light of defect central charges [HHJ15, HHJ17, HH17, FAS21, JORR18, CHO⁺21] and defect C -theorems [KNSW18, JO15, CKRM21, Wan21]. All these imply that studying DCFT would facilitate the theoretical and experimental understanding of our world.

The $O(N)$ vector model is a simple but significant model of statistical field theory. Its bare action in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions is given by

$$I = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x \left[\frac{1}{2} |\partial \Phi_1|^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} |\Phi_1|^4 \right], \quad |\Phi_1|^4 \equiv (\Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\alpha)^2, \quad (1.1)$$

with Φ_1^α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, N$) being an $O(N)$ vector field. This $O(N)$ vector model has played a benchmarking role in exploring critical phenomena (see [Hen22] for a detailed review), and the same goes even in the presence of defects. One of the IR fixed points of this model without

	$N = 1$	$N = 2$	$N = 3$
Theoretical prediction [RG80, Die96]	0.79	0.81	0.82
Experimental data	0.83 ± 0.05 [SF86] 0.8 ± 0.1 [BPH93]	0.75 ± 0.02 [DHPJ91]	$0.825^{+0.025}_{-0.040}$ [ACH82]

Table 1.1: For the surface critical exponent $\hat{\beta}$ defined for the Dirichlet boundary as in (7.6), we list experimental data in three dimensions for $N = 1, 2, 3$ and the standard perturbative results in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensional spacetime at order ϵ^2 extrapolated to three dimensions by setting $\epsilon = 1$. Surprisingly, the theoretical estimate agrees well with the experimental measurements, even at the second order in perturbation theory (see [Her21, section 6.4] for a review on this point).

defects under the RG flow is called the Wilson-Fisher fixed point, which covers a wide range of systems at criticality, giving good agreements with experimental data: statistical Ising model, simple molecular fluids such as water and carbon dioxide, and binary alloy for $N = 1$, XY ferromagnets and statistical XY model for $N = 2$, and statistical Heisenberg model and isotropic magnets for $N = 3$.² One can analytically continue the positive integer parameter N to -2 . Then, the $O(N)$ vector model with $N = 0$ ($N = -2$) can be associated with the model of self-avoiding (loop-erased) random walks.

The boundary critical phenomena of the $O(N)$ vector model have a long history and numerous theoretical studies have been done so far (see e.g., [BM77, RG80, Car84, Die96, DD81a, DD81b, MO95, MO93] and references therein).³ Previous studies have shown that, even with a Dirichlet (free) boundary, one still finds that theoretical predictions agree well with experimental realizations for $N = 1$ [SF86, BPH93], $N = 2$ [DHPJ91] and $N = 3$ [ACH82] (see table 1.1). We can tell from these papers that the experimental measurement of the defect (or boundary and surface) critical exponents relies highly on how we identify macroscopic observables on the defect of our interest within the experimental setup. Hence, more acute predictions of the critical exponents on defects will lead to a deeper insight into the microscopic features of the experimental systems with extended objects.

For the past ten years, various types of defects have been introduced in the $O(N)$ model, such as monodromy [BCG⁺13, GMP13], line [AS14, CKM21], surface [Tre23, GL23] and Replica twist defects [SR23].⁴ These researches have been serving as testing grounds for further consideration

²We note that the Wilson-Fisher fixed point in three dimensions is unstable for $N > N_{\text{crit}}$. due to the presence of a relevant $O(N)$ tensorial operator. As that tensorial operator breaks the $O(N)$ down to the cubic symmetry group, this phenomenon is termed cubic symmetry breaking. Conformal bootstrap reveals numerically that $N_{\text{crit}} < 3$ [CLL⁺20]. We also remark here that the critical $O(2)$ model is expected to describe the lambda point of liquid ⁴He, but with a minor but meaningful discrepancy between theoretical predictions and experimental measurements [LNS⁺03]. The interested readers are referred to [CLL⁺19] for this topic.

³See also [PKM⁺21, Met20, Tol23] for recent developments of critical $O(N)$ with boundary.

⁴The readers who are interested in recent developments of conformal bootstrap and numerical studies using fuzzy sphere regularization [ZHH⁺22, HHZ23a, HHZ23, HHZ23c] are referred to [LRvR12, GLLvV22] and [HHZ23b], respectively.

of defects in theoretical physics. See [BLvV23] for models of fermionic theories, [CKMRM22, ACK⁺23, ACK⁺22] for spin impurities in Wilson-Fisher and gauge theories, and [GK18b, GK18a] for integrable models of DCFT. Moreover, the Ising model ($N = 1$) with a line defect has the potential for experimental realization [PTAW17] and quantum simulation [E⁺20]. This thesis aims to refine theoretical studies of the critical behavior of defects using the critical $O(N)$ vector model for a better understanding of extended objects in nature.

To this end, we focus on the axiomatic framework of the critical phenomena in this thesis and explore DCFT data of the $O(N)$ model in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions with line defect and Neumann/Dirichlet boundary.⁵ The authors of [RT15] proposed the axiomatic framework to test the compatibility of the two approaches: conformal bootstrap and the epsilon expansion via conventional perturbative calculations based on Feynman diagrams and RG analysis. Their original paper postulated three mild assumptions, including conformal symmetry. And they derived anomalous dimensions of the operators in the critical $O(N)$ model in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions up to the leading non-trivial order in ϵ . Their methodology is applied to numerous models [BK15, GGJN15, Raj15, Nii16, GKS17], and later generalized to the case with a monodromy defect in [Yam16, Söd17] and subsequently to boundary and interface [GK20, DS20, HS22b]. As this axiomatic approach is manifestly conformal invariant, it gives us a complementary look compared with the standard perturbative framework that only postulates the scale invariance of the theory. Besides, it is also a powerful analytical tool to study critical phenomena in the presence of a defect where numerical bootstrap techniques are not so effective as, unlike ordinary CFTs without defects, one fails to solve defect crossing equations (3.57) numerically by applying the semidefinite programming methods due to technical reasons (see e.g., [LRvR12, section 4.1] for details on this point).

All these existing researches of axiomatic approach only deal with the conformal dimensions of the lowest-lying defect local operators and fail to talk about composite operators on the defect. In this thesis, we demonstrate that it is possible to access anomalous dimensions of defect composite operators within the axiomatic framework by relying on the analyticity of correlation functions in Euclidean QFTs. The interacting $O(N)$ model with a line defect is not scale invariant unless the defect coupling constant takes an appropriate value [AS14, CKM21]. We have successfully singled out the critical defect coupling using our axioms. We have also calculated the conformal dimensions of various operators on the line defect and checked that they agree with the perturbative results. No research addressed conformal dimensions of composite operators on the Neumann/Dirichlet boundary except the lowest-lying one in the Neumann case. In this thesis, we have investigated a family of boundary composite operators in the conventional perturbative

⁵We are ultimately interested in the DCFT data of the $O(N)$ model in three dimensions with line defect and Neumann/Dirichlet boundary. Hence, throughout our analysis, we will fix the dimension of the defect to one in the line defect case and the co-dimension of the defect to one for the Neumann/Dirichlet boundary. When $N = 1$, the critical $O(N)$ model with a line defect in three dimensions also describes the quantum critical phenomena of the two-dimensional transverse Ising model with a point-like impurity.

framework and the axiomatic approach and confirmed their agreements.

Operators	Dimension	SO($d - 1$) rep.	O($N - 1$) rep.	Free limit	Notes
\widehat{W}_1^1	(5.60)	scalar	singlet	$\widehat{\Phi}_1^1$	—
$\widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$	(5.60)	scalar	vector	$\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$	only for $N \geq 2$
$\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^1$	(5.69)	tensor	singlet	$\widehat{\Phi}_{s+1, i_1 \dots i_s}^1$	—
$\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}$	(5.69)	tensor	vector	$\widehat{\Phi}_{s+1, i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}$	only for $N \geq 2$
\widehat{S}_{\pm}	(5.86)	scalar	singlet	$\{ \widehat{\Phi}_1^1 ^2, \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}} ^2\}$	only for $N \geq 2$
$\widehat{V}^{\hat{\alpha}}$	(5.83)	scalar	vector	$\widehat{\Phi}_1^1 \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$	only for $N \geq 2$
$\widehat{T}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$	(5.84)	scalar	tensor	$\widehat{\Phi}_1^{(\hat{\alpha}} \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\beta)})}$	only for $N \geq 3$
\widehat{W}_p	(5.97)	scalar	—	$ \Phi_1 ^p$	only for $N = 1$

Table 1.2: List of defect local operators treated in this thesis with the classification based on the representation theory of the residual symmetry group on the line defect (5.10). The hatted operators in the free theory side are defect local ones defined by bringing the corresponding bulk fields closer to the line defect such as $\widehat{\Phi}_1^1 = \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^1$ with $|x_{\perp}|$ being the perpendicular distance from the defect. See section 5 for details of their definitions and treatments. The free limits of \widehat{S}_{+} and \widehat{S}_{-} are the linear combinations of $|\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2$ and $|\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}|^2$.

Summary of the result. We here summarize our results:

- We utilize axiomatic framework to study the critical O(N) model in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions. To be more specific, we did the following analysis at the leading order in ϵ :
 - We invent a methodology to study the composite operator spectrum on the defect by requiring the removal of the unphysical singularities of bulk-defect-defect three-point correlators.
 - For a line defect, we have derived the critical defect coupling constant (5.59) and the conformal dimensions of various defect local operators listed in table 1.2 and reproduced the perturbative results [CKM21].
 - In the case of the Dirichlet/Neumann boundary, we have computed the conformal dimensions of the boundary local operators as summarized in table 1.3. We have also performed perturbative calculations to confirm the validity of our machinery.

Boundary condition	Boundary operators	Conformal dimension	Free limit
Neumann	\widehat{W}_{2p}	$2p + \frac{6p(2p-3)}{N+8} \epsilon$	$\widehat{\Phi}_{2p}$
	$\widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha$	$2p+1 - \frac{N+6p(1-2p)+5}{N+8} \epsilon$	$\widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha$
Dirichlet	\widehat{W}_{4p}	$4p - \frac{p(N-6p+14)}{N+8} \epsilon$	$\widehat{\Psi}_{4p}$
	$\widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\alpha$	$4p+2 - \frac{N-6p^2+p(N+8)+5}{N+8} \epsilon$	$\widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha$

Table 1.3: Listed are the conformal dimensions of boundary local operators subject to the Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions. See (6.2) and (6.3) for the definitions of boundary local operators in free theory for the Neumann case. Under Dirichlet boundary conditions, we define the free theory operators as in (7.2) and (7.3).

Organization of the thesis

The rest of this thesis consists of seven chapters and three appendices. The first three chapters are preliminaries for our analysis. In chapter 2 and 3, we introduce standard technologies of CFT and DCFT. In chapter 4, we describe the axiomatic framework with a quick review of the original paper [RT15] and clarify how to modify it in the presence of a defect. We then proceed to our original work and investigate DCFT data of the critical $O(N)$ model with line defect (chapter 5), Neumann boundary (chapter 6), and Dirichlet boundary (chapter 7). At the beginning of each chapter (section 5.1 and the preface of chapter 6 and 7), we attach the review of previous studies of the model while setting notations for the operators of our interest. Chapter 5 is based on [NOS22a], whereas chapter 6 and 7 are on [NOS22b].

Appendix A enumerates several identities used in this thesis. We record a detailed review of the unitarity bound in appendix B. Appendix C is for derivations of the conformal block expansions of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions.

Special notes

This thesis is based on the following papers

- [NOS22a] T. Nishioka, Y. Okuyama, S. Shimamori,
“The epsilon expansion of the $O(N)$ model with line defect from conformal field theory,”
[arXiv:2212.04076 \[hep-th\]](#), **JHEP** **03** (2023), 203
- [NOS22b] T. Nishioka, Y. Okuyama, S. Shimamori,
“Comments on epsilon expansion of the $O(N)$ model with boundary,”
[arXiv:2212.04078 \[hep-th\]](#), **JHEP** **03** (2023), 051

Chapter 2

Foundations of conformal symmetry without defects

This chapter is devoted to a brief review of conformal constraints on Euclidean QFT in three and more dimensions $\mathbb{R}^{d \geq 3}$, referencing several review articles [SD16, Ryc16, Pol07]. We first introduce conformal symmetry in flat Euclidean spacetime (section 2.1) and deliver a conventional way to describe local excitations in CFT by primary and descendant operators (section 2.2). We then describe the notion of path integral in QFT on \mathbb{R}^d (section 2.3) and expand on how it is utilized in CFT, leading to principal concepts such as radial quantization (section 2.4), state/operator correspondence (section 2.5) and Operator Product Expansion (section 2.6). Finally, we illustrate how correlation functions of local operators are constrained from conformal symmetry using the celebrated embedding space formalism (section 2.7).

2.1 Conformal transformation and conformal algebra

Conformal transformations are coordinate transformations $x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu$ that keep angles between any pair of curves. In $d \geq 3$ dimensional flat Euclidean spacetime \mathbb{R}^d with the metric $\delta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1)$ ($\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, d$), they consist of translations, rotations, dilatation and special conformal transformations (SCTs), which are enumerated with their corresponding generators in bold font as follows (see e.g., [DFMS97, SD16, Ryc16]):

$$\text{translation : } \mathbf{P}_\mu \quad x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = x^\mu + a^\mu, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\text{rotation : } \mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu} \quad x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = w^{\mu\nu} x_\nu \quad \text{with} \quad w^{\mu\nu} = -w^{\nu\mu}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\text{dilatation : } \mathbf{D} \quad x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = \lambda x^\mu, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\text{SCT : } \mathbf{K}_\mu \quad x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = \frac{x^\mu + x^2 b^\mu}{1 + 2b \cdot x + b^2 x^2}. \quad (2.4)$$

Notice that SCT can move a point on \mathbb{R}^d to infinity. Hence, for finite conformal transformations to be transitive, we are led to add a point at infinity $\{\infty\}$ to \mathbb{R}^d and consider the one-point compactification of Euclidean spacetime $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{S}^d$.¹

The generators of the conformal group are subject to the following commutation relations:²

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathbf{P}_\rho] &= \delta_{\nu\rho} \mathbf{P}_\mu - \delta_{\mu\rho} \mathbf{P}_\nu, \\
 [\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathbf{K}_\rho] &= \delta_{\nu\rho} \mathbf{P}_\mu - \delta_{\mu\rho} \mathbf{K}_\nu, \\
 [\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathbf{M}_{\rho\sigma}] &= \delta_{\nu\rho} \mathbf{M}_{\mu\sigma} - \delta_{\mu\rho} \mathbf{M}_{\nu\sigma} + \delta_{\mu\sigma} \mathbf{M}_{\nu\rho} - \delta_{\nu\sigma} \mathbf{M}_{\mu\rho}, \\
 [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{P}_\mu] &= \mathbf{P}_\mu, \\
 [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{K}_\mu] &= -\mathbf{K}_\mu, \\
 [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathbf{K}_\nu] &= 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{D} - 2\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \\
 [\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}] &= [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathbf{P}_\nu] = [\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathbf{K}_\nu] = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

One can organize them into the following $(d+2) \times (d+2)$ antisymmetric matrix \mathbf{J}_{MN} :

$$\mathbf{J}_{MN} = \begin{matrix} M \setminus N \rightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ \mu \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & \nu \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_\nu - \mathbf{K}_\nu) \\ -\mathbf{D} & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_\nu + \mathbf{K}_\nu) \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_\mu - \mathbf{K}_\mu) & -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_\mu + \mathbf{K}_\mu) & \mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.6}$$

satisfying the commutation relations of $\text{SO}(1, d+1)$:

$$[\mathbf{J}_{KL}, \mathbf{J}_{MN}] = \eta_{LM} \mathbf{J}_{KN} - \eta_{KM} \mathbf{J}_{LN} + \eta_{KN} \mathbf{J}_{LM} - \eta_{LN} \mathbf{J}_{KM}, \tag{2.7}$$

with the metric $\eta_{MN} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Hence, the conformal group in d -dimensional Euclidean spacetime \mathbb{R}^d is isomorphic to the Lorentz group in $(d+2)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1, d+1}$.

2.2 Local operators in conformal field theory

Next, let us consider how the generators of the conformal group act on local operators $\mathcal{O}(x)$. Because all conformal transformations other than translations leave the origin of spacetime invariant, we first specify how \mathbf{D} , $\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}$ and \mathbf{K}_μ act on the operators at the origin and then recover their actions at general position using the standard relation:

$$\mathcal{O}(x) = e^{x \cdot \mathbf{P}} \mathcal{O}(0) e^{-x \cdot \mathbf{P}}, \quad [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(x)] = \partial_\mu \mathcal{O}(x). \tag{2.8}$$

¹This isomorphism follows from the standard stereographic projection.

²We work in the same notations for conformal generators as in [SD16].

Because $[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}] = 0$, we can simultaneously diagonalize the action of \mathbf{D} and $\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}$ on a local operator:

$$[\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}(0)] = \Delta \mathcal{O}(0) , \quad (2.9)$$

$$[\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{O}(0)] = \mathcal{S}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{O}(0) . \quad (2.10)$$

Here, Δ is referred to as **conformal dimension** of \mathcal{O} and $\mathcal{S}_{\mu\nu}$ is a spin matrix of $\text{SO}(d)$ irreducible representation associated with \mathcal{O} . It follows from the commutation relations (2.5) and Jacobi identity $[A, [B, C]] + [B, [C, A]] + [C, [A, B]] = 0$ that the action of \mathbf{P}_μ (\mathbf{K}_μ) on an operator increments (decrements) its conformal dimensions by one:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{D}, [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)]] &= [\mathbf{P}_\mu, [\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}(0)]] + [[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{P}_\mu], \mathcal{O}(0)] = (\Delta + 1) [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)] , \\ [\mathbf{D}, [\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)]] &= [\mathbf{K}_\mu, [\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}(0)]] + [[\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{K}_\mu], \mathcal{O}(0)] = (\Delta - 1) [\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)] . \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Unitarity requires conformal dimensions to be bounded below. First of all, for any operators, we have $\Delta \geq 0$. And the operator with $\Delta = 0$ corresponds to the identity operator $\mathbf{1}$. Furthermore, when $d \geq 2$, the conformal dimension of an $\text{SO}(d)$ symmetric traceless tensor of rank- J must satisfy the inequality (**unitarity bound**) (see [DMP⁺77, Mac77a, Min97] and appendix B for a review):

$$\Delta \geq \begin{cases} d/2 - 1 & \text{for } J = 0 \\ d + J - 2 & \text{for } J = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases} , \quad (2.12)$$

where the equalities are satisfied for free Klein-Golden fields \mathcal{O}_Δ ($J = 0$) and conserved currents $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}$ ($J = 1, 2, \dots$) such as the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ ($J = 2$):

$$\partial_\mu \partial^\mu \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \Delta = d/2 - 1 , J = 0 , \quad (2.13)$$

$$\partial_{\mu_1} \mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_J}(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \Delta = d + J - 2 , J = 1, 2, \dots . \quad (2.14)$$

In other words, the conformal dimensions of the Klein-Golden field and conserved currents are *protected* and do not change from the canonical (engineering) dimensions in free field theories, even with interactions.

The unitarity bound implies that, for any operators, there must be some positive integer n such that

$$[\mathbf{K}_{\mu_1}, \dots, [\mathbf{K}_{\mu_n}, \mathcal{O}(0)] \dots] = 0 . \quad (2.15)$$

If not, there must be operators whose conformal dimensions are lower than the bound required by unitarity, leading to a contradiction.

Consider a class of operators that are annihilated by the SCT generator \mathbf{K}_μ and call them **primary operators**, or simply **primaries**:

$$[\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)] = 0 \quad \text{for a primary operator } \mathcal{O} . \quad (2.16)$$

The operators made out from a primary \mathcal{O} by acting \mathbf{P}_μ 's are called **descendants** of \mathcal{O} . A family of operators consisting of a primary \mathcal{O} and its descendants is termed **conformal multiplet** of \mathcal{O} . In CFT, one can express arbitrary local operators as a linear combination of primaries and descendants. Because primaries are more fundamental than descendants, we focus on primary operators later in this thesis.

From (2.8) and (2.5), we find that the infinitesimal transformations act on a primary $\mathcal{O}(x)$ at generic position in the following manner [MS69]:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{P}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(x)] &= \partial_\mu \mathcal{O}(x) , \\ [\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{O}(x)] &= (x_\nu \partial_\mu - x_\mu \partial_\nu + \mathcal{S}_{\mu\nu}) \mathcal{O}(x) , \\ [\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}(x)] &= (x \cdot \partial + \Delta) \mathcal{O}(x) , \\ [\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(x)] &= [2x_\mu (x \cdot \partial + \Delta) - x^2 \partial_\mu^2 + x^\nu \mathcal{S}_{\mu\nu}] \mathcal{O}(x) . \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

The above expressions are complicated and clumsy, particularly due to the quadratic terms in x . However, as will be explained in section 2.7, the embedding space formalism provides us a unified look at the conformal transformation laws of primary operators and helps to calculate their correlation functions.

2.3 Path integral in quantum field theory

We here review the basics of the path integral approach and the equal-time quantization in Euclidean QFT based on [PS95, Pol07] to set the stage for the next section.

A Hilbert space of quantum states is associated with each co-dimension one equal-time surface Σ . Throughout this subsection, we decompose spacetime coordinates into Euclidean time direction τ and the other:

$$x^\mu = (\vec{x}, \tau) , \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R} . \tag{2.18}$$

And we often drop the dependence of the spatial coordinates \vec{x} to shorten equations.

Consider a quantum field $\varphi(\vec{x})$ at $\tau = 0$.³ We denote its ket and bra eigenstates with the eigenvalue φ by $|\varphi(\vec{x})\rangle$ and $\langle\varphi(\vec{x})|$ respectively:

$$\varphi(\vec{x}) |\varphi(\vec{x})\rangle = \varphi(\vec{x}) |\varphi(\vec{x})\rangle , \quad \langle\varphi(\vec{x})| \varphi(\vec{x}) = \varphi(\vec{x}) \langle\varphi(\vec{x})| . \tag{2.19}$$

The quantum field in the Heisenberg picture $\varphi(\vec{x}, \tau)$ is related to $\varphi(\vec{x})$ by:

$$\varphi(\vec{x}, \tau) = e^{\tau\mathbf{H}} \varphi(\vec{x}) e^{-\tau\mathbf{H}} , \tag{2.20}$$

³Here, we only consider scalar field for simplicity.

with \mathbf{H} being the Hamiltonian of the theory. We then introduce the instant eigenstates of the quantum field $\varphi(\vec{x}, \tau)$ by the relations:

$$|\varphi(\vec{x}, \tau)\rangle = e^{\tau\mathbf{H}} |\varphi(\vec{x})\rangle, \quad \langle\varphi(\vec{x}, \tau)| = \langle\varphi(\vec{x})| e^{-\tau\mathbf{H}}. \quad (2.21)$$

Let ψ_{fi} and ψ_{in} be some boundary state configurations at $\tau = \tau_{\text{fi}}$ and $\tau = \tau_{\text{in}}$ with $\tau_{\text{in}} < 0 < \tau_{\text{fi}}$, respectively. One can calculate the transition amplitude between the two through the path integral:

$$\langle\psi_{\text{fi}}(\tau_{\text{fi}})|\psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}})\rangle = \langle\psi_{\text{fi}}| e^{-(\tau_{\text{fi}}-\tau_{\text{in}})\mathbf{H}} |\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle = \int_{\varphi(\tau_{\text{fi}})=\psi_{\text{fi}}}^{\varphi(\tau_{\text{in}})=\psi_{\text{in}}} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]}. \quad (2.22)$$

Here, the subscript of φ_{inside} means that the path-integral and the Euclidean action are on the classical fields φ living in the shaded domain in figure 2.1 with the particular boundary conditions. Stated differently, the path integral over the particular domain induces the time evolution between the two boundaries. This implies that the initial state $|\psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}})\rangle$ is created by the path integral with




Figure 2.1: In the equation (2.22), the classical fields are integrated over the shaded region in this figure.

the boundary configuration at $\tau = 0$ unspecified:

$$|\psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}})\rangle = \int_{\varphi(\tau_{\text{in}})=\psi}^{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \int_{\psi}^{\tau=0} \tau = \tau_{\text{in}}. \quad (2.23)$$

Similarly, for the bra state $\langle\psi(\tau')|$, we have the schematic expression:

$$\langle\psi_{\text{fi}}(\tau_{\text{fi}})| = \int_{\varphi(0)=?}^{\varphi(\tau_{\text{fi}})=\psi_{\text{fi}}} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \int_{\tau=0}^{\psi_{\text{fi}}} \tau = \tau_{\text{fi}}. \quad (2.24)$$

One can glue these path integrals together to obtain the transition amplitude (2.22) by summing over all possible boundary configurations along the equal-time slice at $\tau = 0$:

$$\int_{\psi_{\text{in}}}^{\psi_{\text{fi}}} \tau = \tau_{\text{fi}} \tau = \tau_{\text{in}} = \int \mathcal{D}\psi \int_{\psi_{\text{in}}}^{\psi_{\text{fi}}} \tau = \tau_{\text{fi}} \tau = 0 \tau = \tau_{\text{in}}. \quad (2.25)$$

In other words, we have:

$$\langle \psi_{\text{fi}}(\tau_{\text{fi}}) | \psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}}) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\psi \langle \psi_{\text{fi}}(\tau_{\text{fi}}) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}}) \rangle . \quad (2.26)$$

If we perform path integral against classical fields $\mathcal{O}_\alpha^{\text{cl}}(\tau_\alpha)$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, n$) on some specified domain, we obtain the transition amplitude with operator insertions, such as:⁴

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_{\text{fi}}(\tau_{\text{fi}}) | \text{T}_E \{ \mathcal{O}(\tau_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(\tau_n) \} | \psi_{\text{in}}(\tau_{\text{in}}) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\varphi(\tau_{\text{in}})=\psi_{\text{in}}}^{\varphi(\tau_{\text{fi}})=\psi_{\text{fi}}} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_E[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} \mathcal{O}_1^{\text{cl}}(\tau_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n^{\text{cl}}(\tau_n) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

where $\tau_{\text{in}} < \tau_\alpha < \tau_{\text{fi}}$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, n$) and the symbol T_E indicates that the quantum fields are arranged in the ascending order in Euclidean time. For two operators, we have:

$$\text{T}_E \{ \mathcal{O}_1(\vec{x}_1, \tau_1) \mathcal{O}_2(\vec{x}_2, \tau_2) \} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_1(\vec{x}_1, \tau_1) \mathcal{O}_2(\vec{x}_2, \tau_2) & \text{for } \tau_1 > \tau_2 \\ \mathcal{O}_2(\vec{x}_2, \tau_2) \mathcal{O}_1(\vec{x}_1, \tau_1) & \text{for } \tau_2 > \tau_1 \end{cases} . \quad (2.28)$$

The ground state and the vacuum correlation functions. Let us investigate the following limit of the ket state:

$$|\psi(-\infty)\rangle = \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow -\infty} e^{\tau' \mathbf{H}} |\psi\rangle . \quad (2.29)$$

Expanding this expression in the energy eigenbasis by use of the completeness relation $\mathbf{1} = \sum_n |E_n\rangle \langle E_n|$, we find that the dominant contribution comes from the lowest energy state, i.e., the vacuum $|E_0\rangle \equiv |\Omega\rangle$:

$$\lim_{\tau' \rightarrow -\infty} |\psi(\tau')\rangle = \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow -\infty} \sum_n \langle E_n | \psi \rangle e^{\tau' E_n} |E_n\rangle \simeq \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow -\infty} \langle \Omega | \psi \rangle e^{\tau' E_0} |\Omega\rangle . \quad (2.30)$$

Alternatively, the vacuum state $|\Omega\rangle$ can be expressed by the limiting form:

$$|\Omega\rangle = \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow -\infty} (\langle \Omega | \psi \rangle)^{-1} e^{-\tau' E_0} |\psi(\tau')\rangle . \quad (2.31)$$

After putting extra factors into the integral measure, we conclude that the path integral over the lower half-space produces the in-vacuum:

$$|\Omega\rangle = \int^{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_E[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \int_{\tau=-\infty}^{\tau=0} \dots . \quad (2.32)$$


⁴In general, quantum fields inside transition amplitudes are Euclidean time-ordered by construction. See [Pol88, Appendix A] and [PS95, Section 9.2] for details.

A similar representation for the out-vacuum is given by:

$$\langle \Omega | = \int_{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \text{[Diagram: A shaded rectangular region representing a spacetime slice from } \tau=0 \text{ to } \tau=\infty \text{]} \cdot \quad (2.33)$$

The unit-normalized inner product of the in- and out-vacuum states is associated with the integral of the classical field over the whole spacetime:

$$\langle \Omega | \Omega \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\varphi e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi]} = \text{[Diagram: A shaded rectangular region representing the full spacetime from } \tau=-\infty \text{ to } \tau=\infty \text{]} = 1. \quad (2.34)$$

We denote the vacuum correlation function of quantum fields by:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(x_n) \rangle \equiv \langle \Omega | \text{T}_{\text{E}} \{ \mathcal{O}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(x_n) \} | \Omega \rangle. \quad (2.35)$$

Clearly, this corresponds to the following path integral with operator insertions:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(x_n) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\varphi e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi]} \mathcal{O}_1^{\text{cl}}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n^{\text{cl}}(x_n). \quad (2.36)$$

2.4 Path integral in conformal field theory

Leveraging the lessons from the last section, let us see the path integral in CFT. A key difference from QFT is that we choose the dilatation operator \mathbf{D} as the Hamiltonian of CFT rather than one component of the translation generator \mathbf{P}^μ . The quantization via dilatation operator is called **radial quantization** and is of great use in CFT [Pol07, LM75].

We perform Weyl transformation from the (one-point compactification of) flat d -dimensional spacetime $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ to the Euclidean cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ (see figure 2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 &= \delta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \\ &= dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}^2 \quad (x^\mu = r \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}^\mu, r = |x|) \\ &= e^{2\tau} (d\tau^2 + d\Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}^2) \quad (r = e^\tau) \\ &\xrightarrow[\text{transf}]{\text{Weyl}} ds_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}^2 = d\tau^2 + d\Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

Recalling the Weyl transformation law for scalar primaries:

$$\mathcal{O}'_\Delta(x') = \omega^{-\Delta}(x) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x), \quad \text{as} \quad ds'^2(x') = \omega^2(x) ds^2(x), \quad (2.38)$$

we find that a scalar primary operator on the Euclidean cylinder is related to the flat space one as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\text{cyl}}(\tau, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}) = r^\Delta \cdot \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x). \quad (2.39)$$




Figure 2.2: This figure illustrates the Weyl transformation from the (one-point compactification of) Euclidean flat spacetime $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ to the Euclidean cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Equal-time slice at τ on the cylinder side corresponds to the $(d-1)$ -sphere with radius $r = e^\tau$ on the flat spacetime.

Then, from (2.17), the dilatation generator \mathbf{D} acts on $\mathcal{O}^{\text{cyl}}(\tau, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}})$ as:

$$[\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\text{cyl}}(\tau, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}})] = \partial_\tau \mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\text{cyl}}(\tau, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}). \quad (2.40)$$

Hence, we have:

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\text{cyl}}(\tau, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}) = e^{\tau \mathbf{D}} \mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\text{cyl}}(0, \Omega_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}) e^{-\tau \mathbf{D}}. \quad (2.41)$$

Therefore, by comparing this expression with (2.20), we can naturally identify the logarithm of the radial coordinate in the flat spacetime $\tau = \log r$ with the Euclidean cylinder time and the dilatation operator \mathbf{D} as the Hamiltonian of the theory.

Let us perform Weyl transformation to go back to the original spacetime $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$. There, ordinary equal-time quantization on Euclidean cylinder turns into radial quantization, where the spacetime is foliated with $(d-1)$ -spheres centered at the origin to each of which Hilbert space quantum states are assigned. And the time evolution between them is governed by the dilatation operator \mathbf{D} . Be aware that the unit $(d-1)$ -sphere at $\tau = -\infty$ ($\tau = +\infty$) on the Euclidean cylinder is squeezed into a single point O (∞) on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$, allowing us to establish the state/operator correspondence in CFT as we will see shortly.

2.5 State/operator correspondence

Here, we would like to expand on the **state/operator correspondence** in CFT, following [Pol07]. After reviewing a simple proof, we give more on the essence of the correspondence for later use.

Proof of the state/operator correspondence. Let us perform path integral over a unit d -ball against some operator at the origin $\mathcal{A}(0)$. Then, we obtain the ket state $|\mathcal{A}\rangle$ at $r = 1$ that depends on the operator \mathcal{A} we inserted:

$$|\mathcal{A}\rangle = \int^{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_E[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} \mathcal{A}(0) = \text{[Diagram: A unit } d\text{-ball with origin } O \text{ and a point } 1 \text{ on the boundary. A red arrow labeled } \mathcal{A}(0) \text{ points from } O \text{ to } 1 \text{.}] \quad (2.42)$$

On the other way, given an arbitrary ket state $|\Psi\rangle$ at $r = 1$, we prepare the inner product $\langle\psi|\Psi\rangle$ and evaluate the following quantity in two ways:

$$\int \mathcal{D}\psi' \int_{\varphi(r=r')=\psi'}^{\varphi(r=1)=\psi} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} r'^{-D} \langle\psi'|\Psi\rangle. \quad (2.43)$$

Firstly, let us focus our attention on the path integral over spherical shell $r' < r < 1$ (shaded domain in figure 2.3) in the middle of (2.43). This is equivalent to acting r'^D on the ket state $|\psi'\rangle$ which will cancel out by r'^{-D} . As a result, we find that:

$$\int_{\varphi(r=r')=\psi'}^{\varphi(r=1)=\psi} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} r'^{-D} = \langle\psi|\psi'\rangle. \quad (2.44)$$

Plugging this expression into (2.43), we conclude that:

$$\langle\psi|\Psi\rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\psi' \int_{\varphi(r=r')=\psi'}^{\varphi(r=1)=\psi} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} r'^{-D} \langle\psi'|\Psi\rangle. \quad (2.45)$$

By taking the limit $r' \rightarrow 0$, the spherical shell associated with the path integral in the right-hand side of (2.45) (see figure 2.3) becomes a unit d -ball. Hence, we can interpret that the quantity $\langle\psi|\Psi\rangle$ is created by acting some local operator at the origin and performing path integral over the unit d -ball as in (2.42). Because the choice of the bra state $\langle\psi|$ is arbitrary, we can associate every state with some local operator located at the radial quantization origin, substantiating a one-to-one correspondence between a state and a local operator.

More on state/operator correspondence. The in-vacuum state at the unit $(d - 1)$ -sphere corresponds to the identity operator by construction and is created by performing the path integral inside of the unit d -ball:

$$|\Omega\rangle = \int^{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_E[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \text{[Diagram: A unit } d\text{-ball with origin } O \text{ and a point } 1 \text{ on the boundary. A grey arrow labeled } 1 \text{ points from } O \text{ to } 1 \text{.}] \quad (2.46)$$




Figure 2.3: Shaded domain is the spherical shell with inner radius r' and outer radius 1 on d -dimensional Euclidean spacetime. Boundary conditions are imposed both for inner and outer shells.

Also, for the out-vacuum state, we have:

$$\langle \Omega | = \int_{\varphi(0)=?} \mathcal{D}\varphi_{\text{inside}} e^{-S_{\text{E}}[\varphi_{\text{inside}}]} = \text{[Diagram: A gray square containing a dashed circle of radius 1 centered at O, with an arrow pointing from O to the circle boundary labeled 1].} \quad (2.47)$$

These two expressions are consistent with the fact that the operator with the lowest conformal dimension is the identity operator $\mathbf{1}$ in unitary CFTs.

One can compute correlation functions of local operators in CFT through the path integral as in QFT (2.36). However, as we have applied radial quantization, the operators are ordered in the radial direction:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(x_n) \rangle \equiv \langle \Omega | \text{R} \{ \mathcal{O}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}(x_n) \} | \Omega \rangle . \quad (2.48)$$

The symbol R stands for radial ordering. For two arbitrary operators, we have:

$$\text{R} \{ \mathcal{O}(x_1) \mathcal{O}(x_2) \} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(x_1) \mathcal{O}(x_2) & \text{for } |x_1| > |x_2| \\ \mathcal{O}(x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_1) & \text{for } |x_2| > |x_1| \end{cases} . \quad (2.49)$$

The vacuum of CFT is conformal invariant and annihilated by any generators of the conformal group:

$$\mathbf{J}_{MN} | \Omega \rangle = 0 , \quad \langle \Omega | \mathbf{J}_{MN} = 0 . \quad (2.50)$$

A primary operator $\mathcal{O}(0)$ can be identified with the primary state $|\mathcal{O}\rangle \equiv \mathcal{O}(0) | \Omega \rangle$ created by inserting a primary \mathcal{O} at the origin:

$$\mathcal{O}(0) \longleftrightarrow |\mathcal{O}\rangle \equiv \mathcal{O}(0) | \Omega \rangle . \quad (2.51)$$

Similarly to primary operators, one can characterize the primary state by the action of conformal generators: it is an eigenstate of the dilatation \mathbf{D} and rotation generators $\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}$ and annihilated by

the SCT generators \mathbf{K}_μ :

$$\mathbf{D}|\mathcal{O}\rangle = \mathbf{D}\mathcal{O}(0)|\Omega\rangle = [\mathbf{D}, \mathcal{O}(0)]|\Omega\rangle = \Delta|\mathcal{O}\rangle, \quad (2.52)$$

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}|\mathcal{O}\rangle = \mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{O}(0)|\Omega\rangle = [\mathbf{M}_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{O}(0)]|\Omega\rangle = \mathcal{S}_{\mu\nu}|\mathcal{O}\rangle, \quad (2.53)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_\mu|\mathcal{O}\rangle = \mathbf{K}_\mu\mathcal{O}(0)|\Omega\rangle = [\mathbf{K}_\mu, \mathcal{O}(0)]|\Omega\rangle = 0, \quad (2.54)$$

where we used (2.9), (2.10), (2.16) and the conformal invariance of the vacuum (2.50). We can make descendant states associated with \mathcal{O} , that constitute the conformal multiplet of \mathcal{O} , by acting translation generators on $|\mathcal{O}\rangle$:

$$\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\cdots\mathcal{O}(0) \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{P}_\mu\mathbf{P}_\nu\cdots|\mathcal{O}\rangle \equiv \partial_\mu\partial_\nu\cdots\mathcal{O}(0)|\Omega\rangle. \quad (2.55)$$

2.6 Operator Product Expansion

Recall that every local operator can be represented by a linear combination of primaries and descendants as demonstrated in section 2.2. Combining this fact with the state/operator correspondence and the completeness of the Hilbert space, it turns out that primary and descendant states span a complete basis. Let us take $\mathcal{O}(x)|\Omega\rangle$ ($|x| < 1$) for an example. One can express this state by the infinite linear combination of $|\mathcal{O}\rangle$ and its descendant states in the following manner:

$$\mathcal{O}(x)|\Omega\rangle = e^{x\cdot\mathbf{P}}\mathcal{O}(0)e^{x\cdot\mathbf{P}}|\Omega\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (x\cdot\mathbf{P})^n |\mathcal{O}\rangle, \quad (2.56)$$

or

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}(x) \\ \bullet \\ \circ \leftarrow 1 \end{array} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (x\cdot\mathbf{P})^n \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}(0) \\ \bullet \\ \circ \leftarrow 1 \end{array}. \quad (2.57)$$

We are now in a position to consider the state created by acting two primary operators on the vacuum: $\mathcal{O}_1(x_1)\mathcal{O}_2(x_2)|\Omega\rangle$ ($|x_2| < |x_1| < 1$). This state should again be some linear combination of primary and descendant states:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) \\ \bullet \\ \circ \leftarrow 1 \\ \bullet \\ \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \end{array} = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1\mathcal{O}_2\mathcal{O}}(x_1, x_2, \mathbf{P}) \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}(0) \\ \bullet \\ \circ \leftarrow 1 \end{array}, \quad (2.58)$$

that is:

$$\mathcal{O}_1(x_1)\mathcal{O}_2(x_2)|\Omega\rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1\mathcal{O}_2\mathcal{O}}(x_1, x_2, \mathbf{P})|\mathcal{O}\rangle. \quad (2.59)$$

Here, the summation is for all possible primaries, and $C_{\mathcal{O}_1\mathcal{O}_2\mathcal{O}}(x_1, x_2, \mathbf{P})$ is some function that packages the contributions from the single conformal multiplet associated with \mathcal{O} . We can utilize

conformal transformation inside correlators to set two operators inside a unit d -ball $r < 1$, isolating the rest. And the choice of radial quantization origin is arbitrary. Hence, one can upgrade (2.59) to an operator identity termed the **Operator Product Expansion (OPE)**:

$$\mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_1 - x, x_2 - x, \partial/\partial x) \mathcal{O}(x). \quad (2.60)$$

It is convenient to take the quantization origin at the same position as either of the two operators. Then, the OPE takes the form:

$$\mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_2), \quad (2.61)$$

where $x_{ij} = x_i - x_j$. One can make use of the infinitesimal conformal transformation laws by acting \mathbf{J}_{MN} 's on both sides of (2.61) to determine the function $C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2)$. An alternative way to do this is to utilize the fact that primary operators are orthogonal to each other and three- and lower-point functions are fixed up to model-dependent coefficients (see section 2.7). Then, the function $C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2)$ are derived to satisfy the following equality:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_3) \rangle = C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2) \langle \mathcal{O}(x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_3) \rangle. \quad (2.62)$$

It is clear from this expression that a primary operator \mathcal{O} appears in the OPE of \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 if and only if the three-point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O} \rangle$ is non-zero.

The OPE of generic primaries are complicated due to the tensor structure, but only symmetric and traceless tensors appear in the scalar OPEs, and their explicit forms have been studied in many pieces of literature (see e.g., [FGG71, DPPT76, FGPG72, FGP72]).⁵ We here record a few leading terms of the scalar channel OPE of two scalar primaries:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \times \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \supset & \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta})/c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta})}{|x_{12}|^{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 - \Delta}} \\ & \cdot \left(1 + q_1 x_{12}^{\mu} \partial_{2,\mu} + q_2 x_{12}^{\mu} x_{12}^{\nu} \partial_{2,\mu} \partial_{2,\nu} + q_3 x_{12}^2 \square + \dots \right) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x_2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.64)$$

⁵Let $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}$ be a generic tensorial primary operator having J indices of $\text{SO}(d)$. We first make such that $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}$ is traceless because one can decompose any tensorial operators into a sum of traceless tensors. For instance, we have $O^{\mu\nu\rho} = O_3^{\mu\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{d+2} [\delta^{\nu\rho} O_{1;1}^{\mu} + \delta^{\mu\rho} O_{1;2}^{\nu} + \delta^{\mu\nu} O_{1;3}^{\rho}]$ with $O_{1;1}^{\mu} = \delta_{\nu\rho} O^{\mu\nu\rho}$, $O_{1;2}^{\nu} = \delta_{\mu\rho} O^{\mu\nu\rho}$, $O_{1;3}^{\rho} = \delta_{\mu\nu} O^{\mu\nu\rho}$ and $O^{\mu\nu} = O_2^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{d} \delta^{\mu\nu} O_0$ with $O_0 = \delta_{\mu\nu} O_2^{\mu\nu}$. The tensorial primary operator $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}$ can appear in the scalar OPE: $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \times \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}$ if and only if $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(-x) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}(0) \rangle \neq 0$. (It is always possible to go to this configuration using conformal transformations.) The tensor structure of the three-point functions can be made out of x^{μ} and $\delta^{\mu\nu}$:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(-x) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}(0) \rangle = x^{\mu_1} \dots x^{\mu_J} \cdot f_0(|x|) + \delta^{\mu_1 \mu_2} x^{\mu_3} \dots x^{\mu_J} \cdot f_1(|x|) + \dots \quad (2.63)$$

Because the first term is symmetric concerning its indices and the others are uniquely determined from the requirement of the tracelessness, the entire tensor structure in the right-hand side of (2.63) must be symmetric and traceless, so are the indices of the operator $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}$. Hence, only symmetric and traceless tensors have a non-vanishing three-point function against two scalar primaries, and we can verify that only symmetric and traceless tensors appear in the scalar OPE. If $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} = \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}$, Bose symmetry requires the invariance of (2.63) under the replacement $x \leftrightarrow -x$, implying that only even spin operators can appear in the OPE of identical scalars.

where the symbol \square stands for the Laplacian on the d -dimensional flat Euclidean spacetime that acts on the operator located at x as the differential operator $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}$ and the expansion coefficients such as q_1, q_2, q_3 are rational functions of conformal dimensions involved:

$$q_1 = \frac{\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 + \Delta}{2\Delta}, \quad (2.65)$$

$$q_2 = \frac{(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 + \Delta)(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 + \Delta + 2)}{8\Delta(\Delta + 1)}, \quad (2.66)$$

$$q_3 = \frac{(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 + \Delta)(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 - \Delta)}{16\Delta(\Delta + 1)(\Delta + 1 - d/2)}. \quad (2.67)$$

We further denoted scalar two- and three-point coefficients by $c(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \mathcal{O}_\Delta)$ and $c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}_\Delta)$ that will be defined in (2.81) and (2.86) in respective ways.

2.7 Correlation functions

It is virtually impossible to determine correlation functions in general interacting QFTs. However, in CFTs, the conformal symmetry imposes strong constraints and allows to fix correlators up to model-dependent coefficients. Because the conformal transformations are not linear as illustrated in (2.17), it is troublesome to constrain correlation functions. To overcome this difficulty, we first introduce the **embedding space formalism** [Dir36, CPPR11, FGG71, Wei10] that simplifies the situation a great deal. It will turn out that one can still use this methodology even in the presence of a conformal defect.

Embedding space formalism. We embed the d -dimensional Euclidean spacetime \mathbb{R}^d into the projective null cone of the fictitious $(d+2)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime $X^M \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d+1}$ with the metric $ds_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d+1}}^2 = \eta_{MN} dX^M dX^N = -(dX^{-1})^2 + (dX^0)^2 + (dX^1)^2 + \dots + (dX^d)^2$:

$$X^2 = X^M \eta_{MN} X^N = 0, \quad X^M \sim \lambda(X) \cdot X^M \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda(X) > 0. \quad (2.68)$$

Let $\mathcal{O}_\Delta(x)$ be a scalar primary $\mathcal{O}_\Delta(x)$ with conformal dimension Δ . In the embedding space formalism, it turns into an operator that depends on the embedding space coordinate P^M is subject to the homogeneity condition:

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta(\lambda P) = \lambda^{-\Delta} \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P) \quad \leftrightarrow \quad P^M \frac{\partial}{\partial P^M} \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\lambda P) = -\Delta \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P). \quad (2.69)$$

Recall that the Euclidean conformal group in d -dimensions is isomorphic to the Lorentz group in $(d+2)$ -dimensions. One can identify the conformal group with the Lorentz group in the embedding space where the infinitesimal transformation law (2.17) takes a much simpler form:

$$[\mathbf{J}_{MN}, \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P)] = \mathcal{J}_{MN}(P) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P) = - \left(P_M \frac{\partial}{\partial P_N} - P_N \frac{\partial}{\partial P_M} \right) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P). \quad (2.70)$$

One can pull the embedding space coordinates and operators back to the physical Euclidean space-time using the relations:

$$x^\mu = P^\mu / P^+, \quad \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) = |P^+|^{-\Delta} \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x^\mu = P^\mu / P^+). \quad (2.71)$$

Here, we introduced light-cone coordinates $X^\pm = X^{-1} \pm X^0$ to simplify the equation. Because the embedding space coordinate is modded out by \mathbb{R}_+ -scalings $P^M \sim \lambda P^M$, we can always set it back to the physical space by making the following substitution:

$$P^M = (P^+, P^-, P^\mu) = (1, x^2, x^\mu). \quad (2.72)$$

Conformal Ward identities. Consider an n -point correlation function of scalar primaries:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(x_n) \rangle = \langle \Omega | \mathbb{R} \{ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(x_n) \} | \Omega \rangle. \quad (2.73)$$

By use of the embedding space formalism, we can regard this n -point correlation function as a function of embedding space coordinates P_α^A ($\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, n$) with the homogeneity condition inherited from (2.69):

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(\lambda_1 P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(\lambda_n P_n) \rangle = \lambda_1^{-\Delta_1} \cdots \lambda_n^{-\Delta_n} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \rangle. \quad (2.74)$$

Let us utilize conformal invariance to constrain the correlator. To this end, consider the following quantity

$$\langle \Omega | \mathbf{J}_{MN} \mathbb{R} \{ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \} | \Omega \rangle. \quad (2.75)$$

Assuming that the generator \mathbf{J}_{MN} acts on the out-vacuum, due to (2.50), we have

$$\langle \Omega | \mathbf{J}_{MN} \mathbb{R} \{ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \} | \Omega \rangle = 0. \quad (2.76)$$

Doing the other way around, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega | \mathbf{J}_{MN} \mathbb{R} \{ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \} | \Omega \rangle &= \langle \Omega | [\mathbf{J}_{MN}, \mathbb{R} \{ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \}] | \Omega \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\beta=1}^n \mathcal{J}_{MN}(P_\beta) \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2.77)$$

where we used $[A, BC] = [A, B]C + A[B, C]$ and (2.70). Therefore, we obtain the conformal Ward identities:

$$\sum_{\beta=1}^n \mathcal{J}_{MN}(P_\beta) \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \rangle = 0, \quad M, N = -1, 0, 1, \dots, d. \quad (2.78)$$

These identities imply that the n -point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \rangle$ must be composed of $\text{SO}(1, d+1)$ invariant products in the embedding space $P_\alpha \cdot P_\beta = P_\alpha^M \eta_{MN} P_\beta^N$ ($\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, n$). Combining this $\text{SO}(1, d+1)$ invariance with the homogeneity condition (2.74), one can constrain scalar lower-point functions as follows.

One-point functions. Due to the null condition $P^2 = 0$, one fails to make $\text{SO}(1, d+1)$ invariant inner products out of a single embedding space coordinate. Hence, the one-point function should be zero unless the operator is proportional to the identity operator with $\Delta = 0$:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \Delta \neq 0 \\ \text{const.} & \text{if } \Delta = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (2.79)$$

Two-point functions. In this case, we have one building block $P_1 \cdot P_2$. The homogeneity condition (2.74) fixes the scalar two-point function as follows:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(P_2) \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \Delta_1 \neq \Delta_2 \\ c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}) \cdot \frac{1}{(-2P_1 \cdot P_2)^{\Delta_1}} & \text{if } \Delta_1 = \Delta_2 \end{cases}, \quad (2.80)$$

leading to the orthogonality of scalar primaries with different conformal dimensions. We get the physical space correlator by making the replacement $-2P_1 \cdot P_2 \mapsto x_{12}^2$.⁶

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \mathcal{O}_\Delta)}{|x_{12}|^{2\Delta_1}}. \quad (2.81)$$

This orthogonality holds even for spinning primaries, and their two-point functions are also fixed by conformal symmetry. For instance, the two-point function of rank- J symmetric traceless tensors is given by:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \mu_1 \dots \mu_J}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta^{\nu_1 \dots \nu_J}(x_2) \rangle = c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}) \cdot \frac{I_{\mu_1}^{(\nu_1}(x_{12}) \cdots I_{\mu_J}^{\nu_J)}(x_{12})}{|x_{12}|^{2\Delta}}, \quad (2.82)$$

where

$$I_\mu^\nu(x) = \delta_\mu^\nu - \frac{2x_\mu x^\nu}{x^2}. \quad (2.83)$$

Throughout this thesis, the indices enclosed in parentheses are symmetrized and their traces are subtracted. We also note that the two-point coefficients $c(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \mathcal{O}_\Delta)$ and $c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J})$ are positive in unitary CFTs.⁷

⁶From (2.72), we have $P_1 \cdot P_2 = -\frac{1}{2}(P_1^+ P_2^- + P_1^- P_2^+) + \delta_{\mu\nu} P_1^\mu P_2^\nu = -\frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_2)^2$.

⁷We can perform field redefinitions so that two-point functions are unit-normalized, except for operators having canonical definitions. One of the prominent examples of such operators is the stress tensor that is defined directly from the action as its response to the metric perturbation:

$$T^{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\det g}} \cdot \frac{\delta S_E[\varphi, g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \Big|_{g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \delta_{\mu\nu}}. \quad (2.84)$$

The coefficient that appears in the stress tensor two-point function is conventionally denoted by C_T and related to the trace anomaly coefficients through Ward identities [OP93]. In this thesis, we will not unit-normalize two-point functions of composite operators that are defined canonically as coincident limits of non-composite operators, except otherwise noted.

Three-point functions. Now, we can use three $SO(1, d + 1)$ invariants: $P_1 \cdot P_2, P_2 \cdot P_3, P_1 \cdot P_3$. Armed with the homogeneity condition (2.74), we can fix the form of the scalar three-point function up to a model-dependent constant:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(P_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(P_3) \rangle \\ &= \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3})}{(-2P_1 \cdot P_2)^{\frac{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 - \Delta_3}{2}} (-2P_2 \cdot P_3)^{\frac{\Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \Delta_1}{2}} (-2P_1 \cdot P_3)^{\frac{\Delta_1 + \Delta_3 - \Delta_2}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.85)$$

In the physical space, we have:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(x_3) \rangle = \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3})}{|x_{12}|^{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 - \Delta_3} |x_{23}|^{\Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \Delta_1} |x_{13}|^{\Delta_1 + \Delta_3 - \Delta_2}}. \quad (2.86)$$

Likewise, we can determine spinning three-point correlators from conformal symmetry up to three-point coefficients. As an illustration, a scalar-scalar-spin- J three-point function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_J}(x_3) \rangle \\ &= c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}) \cdot \frac{H^{\mu_1}(x_{13}, x_{12}) \dots H^{\mu_J}(x_{13}, x_{12})}{|x_{12}|^{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 - \Delta + J} |x_{13}|^{\Delta_1 - \Delta_2 + \Delta + J} |x_{23}|^{-\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta + J}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.87)$$

with

$$H^\mu(x, y) = \frac{x^\mu}{x^2} - \frac{y^\mu}{y^2}. \quad (2.88)$$

Though only a single structure appears in (2.87), several terms may be possible for more general spinning three-point correlators, to each of which structure constants are associated.

Higher-point functions. So far, we have seen the power of conformal symmetry to fix lower-point functions. Unlike three- and less-point functions, we cannot determine higher-point functions solely from conformal symmetry, as we can make conformal invariants out of four embedding space coordinates such as:

$$\frac{(P_i \cdot P_j)(P_k \cdot P_l)}{(P_i \cdot P_k)(P_j \cdot P_l)}. \quad (2.89)$$

To rephrase it, higher-point functions are non-trivial functions of conformal invariant structures called **cross ratios**. For instance, a scalar four-point function takes the form:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(x_3) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}(x_4) \rangle = T_{(\Delta_3, \Delta_4)}^{(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \cdot g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (2.90)$$

The function $T_{(\Delta_3, \Delta_4)}^{(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ transforms covariantly with local primaries on the left-hand side of (2.90):

$$T_{(\Delta_3, \Delta_4)}^{(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = \frac{1}{|x_{12}|^{\Delta_{12}^+} |x_{34}|^{\Delta_{34}^+}} \cdot \frac{|x_{24}|^{\Delta_{12}^-}}{|x_{14}|^{\Delta_{12}^-}} \cdot \frac{|x_{14}|^{\Delta_{34}^-}}{|x_{13}|^{\Delta_{34}^-}}, \quad \Delta_{ij}^\pm = \Delta_i \pm \Delta_j, \quad (2.91)$$

whereas $g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is some function of cross ratios:

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{x_{12}^2 x_{34}^2}{x_{13}^2 x_{24}^2}, \quad \mathbf{v} = \frac{x_{14}^2 x_{23}^2}{x_{13}^2 x_{24}^2}. \quad (2.92)$$

However, with the help of the OPE (2.61), one can translate an n -point function into the sum of $(n-1)$ -point functions. By doing this operation many times, one can evaluate any-point functions. Hence, all we need is the knowledge of the operator spectrum Δ_i and the three-point coefficients $c(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j, \mathcal{O}_k)$ that govern the fusion rule of primaries. In this sense, model-dependent CFT data is none other than the operator spectrum and a set of three-point coefficients.⁸

There may be many ways to take OPEs, but all of which should give the same result, leading to non-trivial constraints on the CFT data as described below. Let us take scalar four-point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4} \rangle$ as the simplest example. Taking the OPEs of $\mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathcal{O}_3 \times \mathcal{O}_4$, we obtain the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(x_3) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}(x_4) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2) C_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4} \mathcal{O}}(x_{34}, \partial/\partial x_4) \langle \mathcal{O}(x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_4) \rangle \\ &= T_{(\Delta_3, \Delta_4)}^{(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}) c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}, \mathcal{O})}{c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})} \cdot g_{\mathcal{O}}^{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{34}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.93)$$

Here, we implicitly used the orthogonality of primary operators, and the sum is taken over all the possible symmetric and traceless tensors. In the last line of (2.93), we have defined **conformal block** $g_{\mathcal{O}}^{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{34}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ that packages the contribution from a single conformal multiplet. We refer to this type of expansion in CFT, which divides higher-point functions into individual contributions of primaries, as the **conformal block expansion**.

If we swap the first and the third scalar primaries and choose to take the OPEs $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \times \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \times \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}$, we end up with an alternative conformal block expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(x_3) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}(x_4) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \mathcal{O}}(x_{32}, \partial/\partial x_2) C_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4} \mathcal{O}}(x_{14}, \partial/\partial x_4) \langle \mathcal{O}(x_2) \mathcal{O}(x_4) \rangle \\ &= T_{(\Delta_1, \Delta_4)}^{(\Delta_3, \Delta_2)}(x_3, x_2, x_1, x_4) \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}) c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}, \mathcal{O})}{c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})} \cdot g_{\mathcal{O}}^{\Delta_{32}, \Delta_{14}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.94)$$

Equating these two expressions (2.93) and (2.94), we obtain the following equality:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}(x_3) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}(x_4) \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \mathcal{O} \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \end{array} = \sum_{\mathcal{O}'} \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \mathcal{O}' \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3} \end{array}, \quad (2.95)$$

⁸Be aware that one can regard a two-point coefficient $c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ as the three-point coefficient that includes the identity operator: $c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}) = c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}, \mathbf{1})$.

or

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}) c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}, \mathcal{O})}{c(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})} \cdot \frac{g_{\mathcal{O}}^{\Delta_{12}^-, \Delta_{34}^-}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})}{\mathbf{u}^{\Delta_{12}^+}} \\
 = \sum_{\mathcal{O}'} \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_3}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}, \mathcal{O}') c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_4}, \mathcal{O}')}{c(\mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O}')} \cdot \frac{g_{\mathcal{O}'}^{\Delta_{32}^-, \Delta_{14}^-}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})}{\mathbf{v}^{\Delta_{32}^+}}, \tag{2.96}
 \end{aligned}$$

which imposes severe constraints on the CFT data. In the analogy of scattering amplitudes in QFT, this identity that comes essentially from the OPE associativity is called the **crossing equation**.

Chapter 3

Elements of Defect Conformal Field Theory

So far, in the previous chapter, we have seen the power of conformal symmetry in QFT. Thanks to the conformal constraints on the theory, one can fix correlation functions up to model-dependent coefficients. The dilatation operator D works as the Hamiltonian in CFT, resulting in the radial quantization being much more flexible than the equal-time quantization in ordinary QFTs. It simplifies the structure of the Hilbert space quite a lot and enables us to have such concepts as the state/operator correspondence and the convergent Operator Product Expansion. All of these advantages would have never been possible without conformal symmetry.

In this chapter, we give a comprehensive exposition of DCFT mainly based on two seminal papers [[BGLM16](#)] and [[Gad16](#)]. In DCFT, we put a conformal defect operator on the CFT vacuum that keeps the maximal subgroup of the conformal group. Though the conformal defect partially breaks the whole conformal symmetry and makes the theory less constraining (section [3.1](#)), many CFT techniques are still available with few modifications. We have two types of local operators in DCFT: bulk and defect local operators (section [3.2](#)). The bulk local operators are essentially the same as in the case without defects. But defect local operators, which stands for local excitation on the defect, are quantitatively different from bulk ones and should be treated differently. In section [3.2](#), we also exemplify two universal defect local operators that any DCFTs have in their spectrum as the stress tensor in generic CFTs. Performing radial quantization in the presence of the defect, in addition to the ordinary OPEs, one has the Defect Operator Expansions (DOEs) of arbitrary bulk operators (section [3.3](#)). We then explain how we can constrain DCFT correlators by defect conformal symmetry (section [3.4](#)). Lastly, we write down in section [3.5](#) and [3.6](#) the explicit form of the DOE of a bulk scalar primary as well as the DOE spectrum of the Klein-Gordon field, both of which will play pivotal roles in our analysis.

3.1 Defect conformal symmetry

Without loss of generality, we can place a p -dimensional planer conformal defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ at $x^\mu = 0$ ($\mu = p + 1, \dots, d$). In what follows, we divide the flat d -dimensional coordinate x^μ into two parts (see figure 3.1 as an illustration):

$$x^\mu = (\hat{x}^a, x_\perp^i), \quad ds_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 = d\hat{x}^a d\hat{x}_a + dx_\perp^i dx_{\perp,i}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here, \hat{x}^a ($a = 1, \dots, p$) and x_\perp^i ($i = p + 1, \dots, d$) stand for parallel and transverse coordinates to the defect, respectively. Moreover, we use \hat{y} for a point on the defect:

$$\hat{y}^\mu = (\hat{y}^a, 0). \quad (3.2)$$

The conformal defect does not change its shape under parallel conformal transformations and




Figure 3.1: Illustrated is a one-dimensional line defect $\mathcal{D}^{(p=1)}$ in three-dimensional spacetime ($d = 3$). In this case, the spacetime symmetry of defect conformal field theory is conformal symmetry along the defect $\text{SO}(1, 2) \cong \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and rotation around the defect $\text{SO}(2)$.

transverse rotations. Hence, the conformal defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ commutes with corresponding generators:¹

$$[\mathbf{J}_{AB}, \mathcal{D}^{(p)}] = 0, \quad A, B = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.3)$$

$$[\mathbf{J}_{IJ}, \mathcal{D}^{(p)}] = 0, \quad I, J = p + 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, for other generators of conformal transformations that do not keep the shape of the defect, we have:

$$[\mathbf{J}_{AI}, \mathcal{D}^{(p)}] \neq 0, \quad \begin{cases} A = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p \\ I = p + 1, \dots, d \end{cases}. \quad (3.5)$$

¹It is possible for $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ to carry a transverse spin. But, in this thesis, we only consider scalar conformal defects that are singlet under transverse rotations.

Hence, in the presence of the p -dimensional defect, the whole conformal symmetry is broken down to the direct product of **parallel conformal symmetry** and **transverse rotational symmetry**:

$$\text{SO}(1, d + 1) \longrightarrow \text{SO}(1, p + 1) \times \text{SO}(d - p). \quad (3.6)$$

In terms of conformal generators, we illustrate the symmetry-breaking pattern as follows:

$$\mathbf{J}_{MN} = \begin{matrix} M \setminus N \rightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ a \\ i \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & b & j \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_b - \mathbf{K}_b) & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_j - \mathbf{K}_j) \\ -\mathbf{D} & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_b + \mathbf{K}_b) & \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_j + \mathbf{K}_j) \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_a - \mathbf{K}_a) & -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_a + \mathbf{K}_a) & \mathbf{M}_{ab} & \mathbf{M}_{aj} \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_i - \mathbf{K}_i) & -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}_i + \mathbf{K}_i) & \mathbf{M}_{ib} & \mathbf{M}_{ij} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

In what follows, the remaining symmetry group in the presence of the defect is called the **defect conformal group**.

3.2 Bulk and defect local primaries

In DCFT, we start with the fixed background, in which a conformal defect sits on the CFT vacuum. We express localized excitations on and away from the defect by bulk and defect local operators in respective ways (see figure 3.2). The **bulk local operator** $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is classified and denoted in the same way as ordinary CFTs according to the whole conformal group $\text{SO}(1, d + 1)$. So, one can express any bulk local operator by a linear combination of bulk primaries and descendants. On the other hand, the **defect local operator** $\hat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y})$ is organized along with the defect conformal group $\text{SO}(1, p + 1) \times \text{SO}(d - p)$. The former part of the defect conformal group $\text{SO}(1, p + 1)$ acts on defect local operators as the conformal group parallel to the defect, and the latter part $\text{SO}(d - p)$ works just as an *internal symmetry*.




Figure 3.2: The bulk local operator \mathcal{O} stands for the local excitations in the bulk, while the defect local operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ represents local excitations on the defect.

We denote the conformal dimensions of defect primaries such as $\widehat{\Delta}$ to make a distinction from bulk conformal dimensions Δ . The defect primaries can carry two kinds of spins: One comes from the parallel rotation group $SO(p)$ associated with the spacetime symmetry for the defect primaries. The other is related to the transverse rotation group $SO(d-p)$ that behaves just as an internal symmetry group for local operators on the defect. Throughout this dissertation, we only consider defect scalars that are $SO(p)$ singlet but may carry $SO(d-p)$ flavor indices. For interface and boundary ($p = d - 1$), the defect local primaries fail to have transverse spin indices as the transverse rotation group becomes trivial.

The stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ is often referred to as a **universal primary operator** because it is a conserved current $\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ having the protected conformal dimension $\Delta(T_{\mu\nu}) = d$ and exists in any CFTs. Here, as concrete examples of local excitations on the defect, we introduce two **universal defect local primaries: displacement operator** and **tilt operator**. The defect operator spectrum always contains the displacement operator. For each internal symmetry breaking on the defect, there will always be corresponding tilt operators in the theory. These two operators have protected conformal dimensions like the stress tensor.

Displacement operator. In DCFT, the defect breaks the translational symmetry in its perpendicular directions. However, as this violation of translational symmetry is only localized on the defect, one can express it by the following anomalous conservation law of the stress tensor [GMP13, BGLM16]:

$$\partial^\mu T_{\mu a}(x) = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\partial^\mu T_{\mu i}(x) = \delta^{(d-p)}(x_\perp) \cdot \widehat{D}_i(\hat{x}). \quad (3.9)$$

We call the defect local operator appearing on the right-hand side of (3.9) the displacement operator. It represents the local deformation of the defect, and its conformal dimension is protected to be $(p + 1)$ from the scaling property of both sides of (3.9).

In the case of the co-dimension one defects ($p = d - 1$), the displacement operator no longer carries transverse spin indices, and the anomalous conservation law (3.9) can be integrated in the following manner:

$$\lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} T_{\perp\perp}(x) = \widehat{D}(\hat{x}), \quad (3.10)$$

where we have denoted $T_{\perp\perp}(x)$ instead of $T_{dd}(x)$. This identity (3.10) indicates that one can regard the displacement operator in BCFT as the limiting form of the stress tensor.

Tilt operator. Consider the case where the continuous global symmetry group G breaks down to its subgroup H on the defect. Let $J_A^\mu(x)$ be the broken currents, with $A = 1, 2, \dots, \dim(G/H)$. Then, we have the following anomalous conservation law [PKM⁺21, CMRM21, BM80, GLL^vV22]:

$$\partial_\mu J_A^\mu(x) = \delta^{(d-p)}(x_\perp) \cdot \widehat{t}_A(\hat{x}), \quad A = 1, \dots, \dim(G/H). \quad (3.11)$$

We call $\widehat{t}_A(\hat{y})$ the tilt operators. They are associated with violation of the continuous global symmetry and have protected conformal dimensions $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{t}_A) = p$.² When $p = d - 1$, we have $\lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} J_A^\perp(x) = \widehat{t}_A(\hat{x})$ just as the displacement operator (see (3.10)).

3.3 Radial quantization revisited

When a conformal defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ is on the CFT vacuum, one has two ways of quantization: One is to perform radial quantization apart from the defect, while the other is right on the defect. The former allows us to validate the OPE for bulk local operators in the same manner as without defects. Meanwhile, the latter makes it possible to expand arbitrary bulk operators in terms of defect local ones.³

Radial quantization apart from the defect. Let us choose the radial quantization origin such that the unit d -ball integrated to create the in-vacuum does not intersect with the defect:

$$|\Omega\rangle = \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \end{array} \right| . \quad (3.13)$$

The in-vacuum state so obtained is the same one as in ordinary CFTs and is conformally invariant:

$$\mathbf{J}_{MN} |\Omega\rangle = 0, \quad M, N = -1, 0, 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.14)$$

Hence, on this in-vacuum, we can establish the state/operator correspondence and the OPEs for bulk primaries in the same way as in ordinary CFTs without defects:

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) \\ \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \\ \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \end{array} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \mathbf{P}) \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{O}(x_2) \\ \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \end{array} \right| , \quad (3.15)$$

²Recall that the conformal dimensions of spin-one conserved currents are $(d - 1)$ due to the unitarity bound (2.12).

³Though it is not relevant in this thesis, we have an alternative operator expansion in DCFT: Let us perform conformal transformation and map the planer defect to a p -sphere with radius $R (< 1)$ centered at the origin. Owing to the state/operator correspondence, one has the expansion of the conformal defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ in terms of bulk local operators:

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \end{array} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} A_{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{O}}(R, \mathbf{P}) \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{O}^{(0)} \end{array} \right| . \quad (3.12)$$

This operator expansion makes it possible to regard the conformal defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ as a coherent excitation of bulk local operators [Gad16, FKN17].

leading to the **bulk OPE**, or the OPE for bulk primaries:

$$\mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x) \mathcal{O}(x). \quad (3.16)$$

The function $C_{\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x)$ is again fixed up to all orders in $|x_{12}|$ by conformal symmetry and is proportional to the same three-point coefficients $c(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O})$ that appear in the absence of defects. Thus, the fusion rule of bulk primaries in the presence of a defect is the same without defects.

Let us now create an out-vacuum by integrating over the exteriors of the unit d -ball. As the integrated region includes the defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$, this procedure defines the out-state decorated with the defect operator $\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} |$:

$$\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | = \left[\text{Diagram: A gray square with a white circle inside. A vertical orange line labeled $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ is on the right side of the circle. A dot is at the center of the circle. } \right], \quad (3.17)$$

or equivalently $\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | = \langle \Omega | \mathcal{D}^{(p)}$. It follows from (3.3) and (3.5) that this decorated out-vacuum is invariant under defect conformal transformations rather than the whole conformal transformations (see (3.7) for the symmetry breaking pattern due to the defect):

$$\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{AB} = 0, \quad A, B = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{IJ} = 0, \quad I, J = p+1, \dots, d, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{AI} \neq 0, \quad \begin{cases} A = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p \\ I = p+1, \dots, d \end{cases}. \quad (3.20)$$

Radial quantization on the defect and Defect Operator Expansion. If we take the radial quantization origin on the defect, both in- and out-vacuum states are affected by the defect as the integral domains intersect with the defect:

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle = \left[\text{Diagram: A gray circle with a vertical orange line labeled $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ passing through its center. A dot is at the center. } \right], \quad \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | = \left[\text{Diagram: A gray square with a white circle inside. A vertical orange line labeled $\mathcal{D}^{(p)}$ is on the right side of the circle. A dot is at the center of the circle. } \right]. \quad (3.21)$$

They are only invariant under the defect conformal transformations:

$$\mathbf{J}_{AB} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle = \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{AB} = 0, \quad A, B = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{IJ} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle = \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{IJ} = 0, \quad I, J = p+1, \dots, d, \quad (3.23)$$

and


$$\mathbf{J}_{AI} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle \neq 0, \quad \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \mathbf{J}_{AI} \neq 0, \quad \begin{cases} A = -1, 0, 1, \dots, p \\ I = p+1, \dots, d \end{cases}. \quad (3.24)$$

Similarly to section 2.5, one can establish a one-to-one correspondence between a state on the unit d -ball and a defect local operator inserted at the quantization origin. In particular, a defect local primary $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ corresponds to the defect primary state in the following manner:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}(0) \longleftrightarrow |\widehat{\mathcal{O}}\rangle \equiv \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(0) |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle. \quad (3.25)$$

This correspondence makes it possible to expand arbitrary operators in terms of defect local ones.

For a state created by acting two defect primaries on $|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)}\rangle$, we have:




$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2(\hat{y}_2) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{C}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{y}_{12}, \widehat{\mathbf{P}}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}_2), \quad (3.26)$$

with $\widehat{\mathbf{P}}$ being translation generators of the defect conformal group. This expansion is nothing but the **defect OPE**, or the OPE for defect primaries:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2(\hat{y}_2) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{C}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{y}_{12}, \partial/\partial \hat{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}). \quad (3.27)$$

Similarly, by expanding a state with a single insertion of a bulk local operator, we have:



$$\mathcal{O}(x) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} B_{\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{x} - \hat{y}, x_{\perp}, \widehat{\mathbf{P}}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}). \quad (3.28)$$

This operator expansion can be regarded as an operator identity and called the **Defect Operator Expansion (DOE)**, or the **Boundary Operator Expansion (BOE)** in case of boundary:

$$\mathcal{O}(x) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} B_{\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{x} - \hat{y}, x_{\perp}, \partial/\partial \hat{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}). \quad (3.29)$$

In making DOEs, we often match the parallel coordinates of the bulk and the defect local operators just for convenience:

$$\mathcal{O}(x) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} B_{\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(x_{\perp}, \partial/\partial \hat{x}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{x}). \quad (3.30)$$

One can fix the functions that appear in (3.27) and (3.30) by comparing the defect conformal transformation law for both sides of the equations or by applying these operator identities inside correlation functions:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}) \rangle = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} B_{\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(x_{\perp}, \partial/\partial \hat{x}) \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{x}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}) \rangle, \quad (3.31)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2(\hat{y}_2) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_3(\hat{y}_3) \rangle = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{C}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2 \widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{y}_{12}, \partial/\partial \hat{y}_2) \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}_2) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{y}_3) \rangle. \quad (3.32)$$

Hence, the two functions $B_{\mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(x_{\perp}, \partial/\partial\hat{x})$ and $\widehat{C}_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2\widehat{\mathcal{O}}}(\hat{y}_{12}, \partial/\partial\hat{y})$ are proportional to the bulk-defect two-point coefficients of $\langle \mathcal{O}\widehat{\mathcal{O}} \rangle$ and the defect three-point coefficients of $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_2\widehat{\mathcal{O}} \rangle$ in respective ways ($b(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}})$ in (3.52) and $c(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \widehat{\mathcal{O}})$ in (3.45) for scalar cases, see the next section for details). In particular, for the identity channel DOE of a bulk primary \mathcal{O} , the function $B_{\mathcal{O}\mathbf{1}}(x_{\perp}, \partial/\partial\hat{x})$ is proportional to the bulk one-point coefficient $a(\mathcal{O})$ (see (3.49) for the definition for bulk scalars), since $b(\mathcal{O}, \mathbf{1})$ can be identified with $a(\mathcal{O})$.

3.4 Correlation functions

We now use the embedding space formalism to investigate correlation functions in DCFT similarly to section 2.7. Within this formalism, we can treat bulk scalar primaries in the same manner as without defect, while we must make a little twist for defect local primaries with $\text{SO}(d-p)$ flavor indices. After setting the stage, we will systematically construct DCFT correlators, exploiting homogeneity conditions and defect conformal Ward identities in the embedding space coordinates.

Embedding space formalism for defect scalar primaries. We deal with defect scalar primaries with $\text{SO}(d-p)$ flavor indices using the embedding space formalism combined with encoding polynomial techniques for symmetric traceless tensors. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y})$ be a defect scalar primary operator with conformal dimension $\widehat{\Delta}$ and transverse spin of rank- s . We denote its embedding space encoding polynomial of degree- s by $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W)$. We impose the following homogeneity condition on $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W)$:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(\lambda Q, \alpha W) = \lambda^{-\widehat{\Delta}} \alpha^s \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W) \quad \lambda, \alpha > 0. \quad (3.33)$$

Here, we denoted the embedding space coordinates on the defect by $Q^M = (Q^A, Q^I = 0)$ being subject to the relation $Q^2 = Q^A Q_A = 0$. We also introduced a polarization vector associated with the transverse rotation group $W^M = (W^A = 0, W^I)$ with $W^I \in \mathbb{C}^{d-p}$ and $W^2 = W^I W_I = 0$. The generators of the defect conformal group act on the embedding space encoding polynomial $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W)$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{J}_{AB}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W)] &= \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{AB}(Q, W) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W) \\ &= - \left(Q_A \frac{\partial}{\partial Q_B} - Q_B \frac{\partial}{\partial Q_A} \right) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W), \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{J}_{IJ}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W)] &= \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{IJ}(Q, W) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W) \\ &= - \left(W_I \frac{\partial}{\partial W_J} - W_J \frac{\partial}{\partial W_I} \right) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}(Q, W). \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

We recover the physical space encoding polynomial $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\Delta,s}(\hat{y}, w)$ by setting:

$$Q^A = (1, \hat{y}^2, \hat{y}^a), \quad W^i = w^i, \quad w^2 = w^i w_i = 0. \quad (3.36)$$

After stripping all polarization vector w^i and subtracting traces, we recover $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\Delta, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y})$.

Defect conformal Ward identities. We define correlation functions of local primaries in DCFT $\langle \dots \rangle_{\text{DCFT}}$ in relation to CFT correlators $\langle \dots \rangle_{\text{CFT}}$ by:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \dots \rangle_{\text{DCFT}} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \dots \rangle_{\text{CFT}}}{\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \rangle_{\text{CFT}}}. \quad (3.37)$$

For the expectation value of the identity operator to be one $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle_{\text{DCFT}} = 1$, the right-hand side of (3.37) is divided by the one-point function of the conformal defect operator:

$$\langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \rangle_{\text{CFT}} \equiv \langle \Omega | \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \Omega \rangle = \langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \Omega \rangle = \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} \rangle. \quad (3.38)$$

One can expand the numerator in the right-hand side of (3.37) in two ways by choosing radial quantization origin on and away from the defect (see the second and the third line, respectively):

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \dots \rangle_{\text{CFT}} \\ &= \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \text{R}\{\mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \dots\} | \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} | \text{R}\{\mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(\hat{y}_1) \dots\} | \Omega \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

In both cases, the similar manipulation to section 2.7 by use of the embedding space formalism leads to the defect conformal Ward identities. In particular, for the correlation functions of bulk and defect scalar primaries, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \mathcal{J}_{AB}(P_\alpha) + \sum_{\beta=1}^m \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{AB}(Q_\beta, W_\beta) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \dots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(Q_1, W_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_m(Q_m, W_m) \rangle_{\text{DCFT}} = 0, \\ & \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \mathcal{J}_{IJ}(P_\alpha) + \sum_{\beta=1}^m \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{IJ}(Q_\beta, W_\beta) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(P_1) \dots \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_n}(P_n) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_1(Q_1, W_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_m(Q_m, W_m) \rangle_{\text{DCFT}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Akin to the CFT case, we learn from these defect conformal Ward identities that DCFT correlators depend on the embedding space coordinates only through the defect conformal invariants such as:

$$X \cdot X' = X^M X'_M, \quad X \bullet X' = X^A X'_A, \quad X \circ X' = X^I X'_I. \quad (3.41)$$

Though conformal symmetry seems less constraining than without defect, it is still powerful enough to fix correlation functions up to model-dependent coefficients as in ordinary CFTs. In what follows, we abbreviate the subscript in $\langle \dots \rangle_{\text{DCFT}}$ to simplify the notations unless otherwise noted and construct scalar correlation functions in DCFT.

Correlation functions of defect primaries. With no bulk operator insertions, DCFT correlation functions behave in the same manner as p -dimensional CFT correlators with $SO(d-p)$ flavor indices. All one-point functions vanish due to the conformal symmetry on the defect. Defect primaries in different irreducible representations are orthogonal. The two-point function of defect identical primaries in the embedding space is as follows:

$$\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}(Q_1, W_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}(Q_2, W_2) \rangle = c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{(W_1 \circ W_2)^s}{(-2Q_1 \circ Q_2)^{\widehat{\Delta}}}, \quad (3.42)$$

which, in physical space, reduces to:⁴

$$\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},j_1 \dots j_s}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{\delta_{j_1}^{i_1} \dots \delta_{j_s}^{i_s}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}}}. \quad (3.44)$$

Three-point functions of defect scalar primaries are rather involved due to the transverse spin structures. Here, we only mention two cases of importance in this thesis. When all operators are singlet in the transverse rotation group, the three-point correlator takes the same form as the CFT scalar three-point function (2.86):

$$\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_3}(\hat{y}_3) \rangle = \frac{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_3})}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{\widehat{\Delta}_1 + \widehat{\Delta}_2 - \widehat{\Delta}_3} |\hat{y}_{23}|^{\widehat{\Delta}_2 + \widehat{\Delta}_3 - \widehat{\Delta}_1} |\hat{y}_{13}|^{\widehat{\Delta}_1 + \widehat{\Delta}_3 - \widehat{\Delta}_2}}. \quad (3.45)$$

Meanwhile, when only one of the three primary operators has transverse spin indices, their correlation functions must vanish identically, as one cannot make $SO(d-p)$ -invariants out of a single polarization vector W^I :

$$\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}_3) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } s \neq 0. \quad (3.46)$$

As in the CFT case, four and higher-point functions depend non-trivially on cross ratios and cannot be fixed solely from defect conformal symmetry. Nonetheless, one can investigate them by utilizing the defect OPEs (3.27) to reduce higher-point functions into the sum of lower-point ones.

⁴For instance, the two-point function of the displacement operator is fixed by defect conformal symmetry to have the form:

$$\langle \widehat{D}^i(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{D}^j(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = C_{\widehat{D}} \cdot \frac{\delta^{ij}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{2(p+1)}}. \quad (3.43)$$

The coefficient $C_{\widehat{D}}$ is related to defect trace anomaly coefficients that are key ingredients characterizing the dynamics of the defect (see e.g., [CHO+21, HHJ17, JORR18, BMMS15]).

Bulk one-point functions. Unlike the case without defects, we have a single building block $P \circ P (= -P \bullet P)$, and the bulk scalar one-point function does not vanish:⁵

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P) \rangle = \frac{a(\mathcal{O}_\Delta)}{(P \circ P)^{\frac{\Delta}{2}}}. \quad (3.48)$$

Back to physical space, we have:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \rangle = \frac{a(\mathcal{O}_\Delta)}{|x_\perp|^\Delta}. \quad (3.49)$$

Bulk-defect two-point functions. We can construct a bulk-defect two-point function out of three defect conformal invariants $P \circ P, P \bullet Q, P \circ W$:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(P) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}(Q, W) \rangle = b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{(P \circ W)^s}{(-2P \bullet Q)^{\widehat{\Delta}} (P \circ P)^{\frac{\Delta - \widehat{\Delta} + s}{2}}}. \quad (3.50)$$

Reduction to physical space follows from the following replacements combined with stripping off w^i 's and subtracting traces:

$$P \circ P \mapsto |x_\perp|^2, \quad -2P \bullet Q \mapsto |\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2 + |x_\perp|^2, \quad P \circ W \mapsto x_\perp \cdot w. \quad (3.51)$$

We end up with the following expression:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}) \rangle = b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{(i_1} \dots x_\perp^{i_s)}}{(|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2 + |x_\perp|^2)^{\widehat{\Delta}} |x_\perp|^{\Delta - \widehat{\Delta} + s}}. \quad (3.52)$$

On higher-point functions: DCFT data and crossing constraints. We again cannot fix higher-point functions, as they depend on the defect conformal invariants. Nevertheless, one can compute any-point functions utilizing DOEs and bulk/defect OPEs. All we need to do that is a set of model-dependent DCFT data, *i.e.*, the bulk and defect operator spectra and bulk/defect three-point coefficients that govern the fusion rules of bulk and defect primaries, and bulk-defect two-point coefficients that control defect operator contents that appear in the DOEs of bulk primaries:

$$\{\Delta, \widehat{\Delta}, c(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j, \mathcal{O}_k), c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_i, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_j, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_k), b(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}), a(\mathcal{O})\}. \quad (3.53)$$

This DCFT data is redundant: One can evaluate any correlators in CFT only by using DOEs and defect OPEs, but one still has bulk OPEs. The simplest example to illustrate this redundancy

⁵While we do not use in this thesis, spinning bulk primary can also have a non-zero one-point function except the case of co-dimension one defects. For instance, the one-point function of the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ turns out to be:

$$\langle T_{ab}(x) \rangle = \frac{d-p-1}{d} \cdot \frac{a(T)}{|x_\perp|^d} \delta_{ab}, \quad \langle T_{ij}(x) \rangle = -\frac{a(T)}{|x_\perp|^d} \cdot \left(\frac{p+1}{d} \delta_{ij} - \frac{x_i x_j}{|x_\perp|^2} \right), \quad \langle T_{ai}(x) \rangle = 0. \quad (3.47)$$

The one-point coefficient $a(T)$ is related to the boundary trace anomaly coefficients via Ward identities and carries dynamical information of the defect (see e.g., [JORR18, BL19]).

would be the bulk scalar two-point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \rangle$, depending non-trivially on two defect conformal invariants:

$$\frac{P_1 \circ P_2}{(P_1 \circ P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(P_2 \circ P_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \xrightarrow[\text{space}]{\text{physical}} \frac{x_{1,\perp} \cdot x_{2,\perp}}{|x_{1,\perp}| \cdot |x_{2,\perp}|}, \quad (3.54)$$

$$\frac{-2P_1 \cdot P_2}{(P_1 \circ P_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(P_2 \circ P_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \xrightarrow[\text{space}]{\text{physical}} \frac{|x_{12}|^2}{|x_{1,\perp}| \cdot |x_{2,\perp}|}. \quad (3.55)$$

Similarly to the CFT four-point functions, one can investigate $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \rangle$ by performing the bulk OPE $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \times \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}$ or taking the DOEs of two bulk primaries:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \rangle &= \sum_{\mathcal{O}} C_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}(x_{12}, \partial/\partial x_2) \langle \mathcal{O}(x_2) \rangle, \\ &= \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} B_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(x_{1,\perp}, \partial/\partial \hat{x}_1) B_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(x_{2,\perp}, \partial/\partial \hat{x}_2) \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{x}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{x}_2) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

This identity is a DCFT version of crossing equation [LRvR12, BGLM16] and expected to give enough constraints to eliminate the redundancy of the DCFT data (3.53):

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2}(x_2) \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \mathcal{O} \end{array} \Big|_{\mathcal{D}(p)} = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{O}} \\ \text{---} \\ \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_2} \end{array} \Big|_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(p)}. \quad (3.57)$$

Bulk-defect-defect three-point functions. Lastly, we explain bulk-defect-defect three-point functions of scalar primaries that will be of great use in our analysis. We cannot fix them just from defect conformal symmetry but can evaluate them with the aid of DOEs. Throughout this thesis, we restrict ourselves to the case where two defect scalar primaries have no transverse spin indices. We now summarize the conformal block expansion of the bulk-defect-defect three-point functions and relegate its complete but somewhat lengthy derivation to appendix C.

First of all, we make use of defect conformal symmetry to fix a bulk-defect-defect three-point function of scalar primaries up to some function of a single defect conformal invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \rangle \\ = \frac{g(v)}{(P \circ P)^{\frac{\Delta}{2}} (-2P \bullet Q_1)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}} (-2P \bullet Q_2)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2}} (-2Q_1 \bullet Q_2)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^+}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

where $\widehat{\Delta}_{ij}^{\pm} = \widehat{\Delta}_i \pm \widehat{\Delta}_j$ and the defect cross ratio v is given by:

$$v = \frac{(P \circ P) (-2Q_1 \bullet Q_2)}{(-2P \bullet Q_1) (-2P \bullet Q_2)}. \quad (3.59)$$

In going back to physical space, we have:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = T_{\Delta}^{\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2}(x, \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \cdot g(v). \quad (3.60)$$

Here, the function $T_{\Delta}^{\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2}(x, \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2)$ behaves in the same way as the left-hand side of (3.60) under defect conformal transformations. The cross ratio in the physical space is given by:

$$v = \frac{|x_{\perp}|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^2}{|x - \hat{y}_1|^2 |x - \hat{y}_2|^2}, \quad (3.61)$$

Notice that v is related to an angle of the triangle formed by the three points x, \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2 (see figure 3.3) by $v = (\sin \theta)^2$. This geometrical interpretation follows immediately by considering the area of the triangle in two ways:

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \cdot |x_{\perp}| \cdot |\hat{y}_{12}| = \frac{1}{2} \cdot |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1| \cdot |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2| \cdot |\sin \theta|. \quad (3.62)$$

Hence, the defect cross ratio takes its value within the interval $[0, 1]$:

$$0 \leq v \leq 1. \quad (3.63)$$

The former equality is satisfied when the triangle collapses, whereas the latter holds whenever $\theta = \pi/2$. The function of defect conformal invariant $g(v)$ can be evaluated by performing the




Figure 3.3: The triangle spanned by one point x on the bulk and two points \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2 on the defect $\mathcal{D}(p)$. The angle θ does not change under defect conformal transformations and is related to the defect cross ratio (3.61) by $v = (\sin \theta)^2$.

DOE of the bulk operator $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x)$ to have the following expression:

$$g(v) = \sum_{\widehat{\Delta}} \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}) c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2})}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v). \quad (3.64)$$

Here, we have denoted the conformal block in this expansion by $G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v)$ which collects all the contributions from a single DOE channel of \mathcal{O}_{Δ} and has the following expression:

$$G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v) = v^{\widehat{\Delta}/2} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}, \frac{\widehat{\Delta} - \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}; \widehat{\Delta} + 1 - \frac{p}{2}; v \right). \quad (3.65)$$

We have used the standard definitions of Gauss's hypergeometric function:

$${}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha)_n (\beta)_n}{(\gamma)_n n!} \cdot z^n, \quad (3.66)$$

where $(a)_n$ stands for the Pochhammer symbol defined through the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} (a)_n &= a \cdot (a+1) \cdots (a+n-1) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(a+n)}{\Gamma(a)} \quad \text{for } a \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

Notably, only $\text{SO}(d-p)$ singlets contribute to the expansion because of (3.46).

Because the general form of the bulk-defect-defect three-point function is rather involved, for the sake of simplicity, it is convenient to utilize defect conformal transformations to set $(\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \mapsto (0, \infty)$, while defining the defect local primaries at the infinity by:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\infty) = \lim_{|\hat{y}| \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{y}). \quad (3.68)$$

Then, one ends up with the following simplified expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(0) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\infty) \rangle &= \frac{1}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_2}} \cdot \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}) c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2})}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(v), \\ G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(v) &= v^{\widehat{\Delta}/2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_2}{2}, \frac{\widehat{\Delta} - \widehat{\Delta}_2}{2}; \widehat{\Delta} + 1 - \frac{p}{2}; v\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.69)$$

with $v = |x_{\perp}|^2/|x|^2$ being the defect cross ratio in this frame.

3.5 Defect Operator Expansion of bulk scalar primary

We here record the explicit form of the DOE of a bulk scalar primary $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x)$ [BGLM16, appendix B.1]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x) &= \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}}} \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_{\perp}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s} (-1)^n |x_{\perp}|^{2n-s}}{2^{2n} (\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2)_n n!} \cdot (\widehat{\partial}_x^2)^n \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.70)$$

where the coefficients $b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})$ and $c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})$ are bulk-defect and defect two-point coefficients defined in (3.52) and (3.44), respectively. The sum is taken over all possible defect scalar

primaries with transverse spin indices. Notably, there are no contributions from defect primaries with parallel spin indices.⁶

We can confirm (3.70) by using it inside the bulk-defect two-point function (3.52):⁷

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}) \rangle &= \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}}} \\
&\cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_\perp^{j_1} \dots x_\perp^{j_s} (-1)^n |x_\perp|^{2n-s}}{2^{2n} (\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2)_n n!} \cdot (\widehat{\partial}_x^2)^n \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},j_1 \dots j_s}(\hat{x}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}) \rangle \\
&= \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s})}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}}} \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_\perp^{j_1} \dots x_\perp^{j_s} (-1)^n |x_\perp|^{2n-s}}{2^{2n} (\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2)_n n!} \cdot (\widehat{\partial}_x^2)^n \frac{\delta_{j_1}^{i_1} \dots \delta_{j_s}^{i_s}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}}} \\
&= b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{i_1} \dots x_\perp^{i_s}}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}+s} |\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}}} \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\widehat{\Delta})_n}{n!} \left(-\frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2} \right)^n \\
&= b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta},s}) \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{i_1} \dots x_\perp^{i_s}}{(|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2 + |x_\perp|^2)^{\widehat{\Delta}} |x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}+s}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.73}$$

In the case of boundary, the transverse rotational group becomes trivial, and we do not have to care about spin structures. Hence, the BOE of a bulk scalar takes the simpler form:

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) = \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n |x_\perp|^{2n}}{2^{2n} (\widehat{\Delta} + 3/2 - d/2)_n n!} (\widehat{\partial}_x^2)^n \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}). \tag{3.74}$$

3.6 Defect Operator Expansion spectrum of free scalar field

In this section, we illustrate the defect operator contents that appear in the DOE of the free Klein-Gordon field in two- and more-dimensional spacetime for later use. We here do not deal with the case where the bulk Klein-Gordon field is not single-valued against the rotation around the defect, such as a monodromy defect. See refs. [LLVRZ20, Söd17] for readers who are interested in this point.

Let $\phi(x)$ be a Klein-Gorden field that satisfies the Klein-Gorden equation as an operator identity:

$$\Box \phi(x) = 0, \tag{3.75}$$

⁶We can verify this fact similarly to footnote 5 in section 2.6.

⁷In deriving this, we have used the following identities and (3.44):

$$(\widehat{\partial}_x^2)^n \frac{1}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}}} = \frac{2^{2n} (\widehat{\Delta})_n (\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2)_n}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}+2n}}, \tag{3.71}$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\widehat{\Delta})_n}{n!} \left(-\frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2} \right)^n = \frac{1}{(1 + |x_\perp|^2/|\hat{x} - \hat{y}|^2)^{\widehat{\Delta}}}. \tag{3.72}$$

with \square being the Laplacian in the flat d -dimensional spacetime. Owing to the defect conformal symmetry, we obtain the following DOE of $\phi(x)$ (3.70):

$$\phi(x) \supset A \frac{x_{\perp}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s}}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta_{\phi} - \widehat{\Delta} + s}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \cdots i_s}(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) , \quad (3.76)$$

with $A \equiv b(\phi, \widehat{\mathcal{O}})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}) \neq 0$ and $\Delta_{\phi} = d/2 - 1$. Because the Klein-Gorden field is subject to the Klein-Gorden equation (3.75), the right-hand side of (3.76) should vanish identically against the action of the Laplace differential operator $\square_x \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\mu}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \square_x A \frac{x_{\perp}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s}}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta_{\phi} - \widehat{\Delta} + s}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \cdots i_s}(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) \\ &= A (\widehat{\Delta} - s - \Delta_{\phi})(\widehat{\Delta} + s - \Delta_{\phi} + d - p - 2) \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{x_{\perp}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s}}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta_{\phi} - \widehat{\Delta} + s}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \cdots i_s}(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.77)$$

where we used the following identity:

$$\square_x \frac{x_{\perp}^{(i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s)}}{|x_{\perp}|^{\delta}} = \delta(\delta + 2 - d + p - 2s) \cdot \frac{x_{\perp}^{(i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s)}}{|x_{\perp}|^{\delta+2}} . \quad (3.78)$$

For A to be non-zero, one has the following equation:

$$(\widehat{\Delta} - s - \Delta_{\phi})(\widehat{\Delta} + s - \Delta_{\phi} + d - p - 2) = 0 . \quad (3.79)$$

There are two solutions to this equation:

$$\widehat{\Delta} = \frac{d-2}{2} + s , \quad (3.80)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Delta} = 1 + p - s - \frac{d}{2} . \quad (3.81)$$

Remarks on the first solution (3.80). The first case (3.80) is compatible with the unitarity bound of the p -dimensional CFT on the defect:

$$\widehat{\Delta} \geq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } p = 1, 2 \\ \frac{p-2}{2} & \text{for } p = 3, \dots, d-1 \end{cases} , \quad (3.82)$$

where the equality is satisfied by the identity operator for $p = 1, 2$ and the Klein-Gorden field on the defect for $p = 3, \dots, d-1$. One may identify the primary operator having the conformal dimension specified by the condition (3.80) with the one defined through the limiting form:

$$\widehat{\phi}_{i_1 \cdots i_s}(\hat{x}) = \lim_{x_{\perp} \rightarrow 0} \partial_{(i_1} \cdots \partial_{i_s)} \phi(x) , \quad (3.83)$$

To be more precise, the operator $\widehat{\phi}_{i_1 \cdots i_s}(\hat{x})$ is defined inside correlators, if necessary, by subtracting divergences associated with the limit, so that they are finite and remain defect conformal invariant.

Remarks on the second solution (3.81). First of all, in the case of the co-dimension one defect $p = d - 1$ where the transverse spin is trivial, the condition (3.81) turns out to be $\widehat{\Delta} = d/2$, in line with the unitarity bound on the defect (3.82). The corresponding operator can be identified with $\widehat{\phi}'$ defined through the limiting form $\widehat{\phi}'(\hat{x}) = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |x_\perp|^{-1} \phi(x)$.

The identity operator with $\widehat{\Delta} = s = 0$ can appear only when $p = d/2 - 1$. Relatedly, the bulk one-point functions of the Klein-Gordon field must vanish unless $p = d/2 - 1$. An example of this case is a line defect in four-dimensional spacetime ($d = 4, p = 1$) that will be our main focus in section 5.2.

Let us investigate (3.81) further combined with the unitarity bound on the defect (3.82), which implies:

$$\begin{cases} s \leq 2 - \frac{d}{2} & \text{for } p = 1 \\ s \leq 2 - \frac{d-p}{2} & \text{for } p = 2, \dots, p-2 \end{cases}. \quad (3.84)$$

For one-dimensional defect ($p = 1$), we cannot solve this inequality with finite s .⁸ For $p = 2, \dots, p-2$ the inequality is satisfied by the Klein-Gordon field on the co-dimension two defects with one transverse spin index ($p = d - 2, \widehat{\Delta} = p/2 - 1$ and $s = 1$). This situation is realized in vector coupled with co-dimension two matter (see [BGLM16, the last example of section 5.4]) but is irrelevant in this thesis.

⁸The only solution for $p = 1$ seems $d = 2, s = 1$. In this case, however, the transverse rotational group becomes trivial, leading to a contradiction.

Chapter 4

Review of Rychkov-Tan's approach to critical phenomena

This chapter is an introduction to the axiomatic approach to critical phenomena. After reviewing a conventional perturbative study of the critical $O(N)$ model without defects in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions (section 4.1), we expand on Rychkov-Tan's axiomatic approach [RT15] (section 4.2). We then describe a generalization of the axiomatic approach in the presence of a defect proposed by [Yam16] (section 4.3).

4.1 Critical $O(N)$ vector model without defects

Here, we review a perturbative study of the $O(N)$ vector model without defects (see e.g., [WF72, WK74, Col86, PS95, HVF01, Kar07], and also [Hen22] for a comprehensive review). The bare action of the $O(N)$ vector model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions is given by:

$$I = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial \Phi_1|^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} |\Phi_1|^4 \right), \quad |\Phi_1|^4 \equiv (\Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\alpha)^2. \quad (4.1)$$

We denote an $O(N)$ vector field by Φ_1^α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, N$). The two-point function of Φ_1^α in the free limit ($\lambda_0 = 0$) is normalized as follows:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_{\lambda_0=0} = \frac{1}{(d-2) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \cdot \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_{12}|^{d-2}}, \quad (4.2)$$

with $\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = 2\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2)$ being the volume of a unit $(d-1)$ -sphere. We work in the massless renormalization in the minimal subtraction scheme by setting the bare and renormalized mass to zero, as we are only interested in the Wilson-Fisher fixed point.

We first introduce **wave-function renormalization** Z_1 and denote the **renormalized operator** by $W_1^\alpha(x)$ henceforth:

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) = Z_1 \cdot W_1^\alpha(x). \quad (4.3)$$

Assuming $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we expand the bare coupling λ_0 and the wave-function renormalization Z_1 in inverse powers of ϵ to cancel the divergences of the correlation functions of renormalized operators such as $\langle W_1^\alpha W_1^\beta \rangle = Z_1^{-2} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta \rangle$ and $\langle W_1^\alpha W_1^\beta W_1^\gamma W_1^\sigma \rangle = Z_1^{-4} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta \Phi_1^\gamma \Phi_1^\sigma \rangle$. Through standard diagrammatic calculations, one finds that:

$$Z_1 = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^4} \cdot \frac{N+2}{36\epsilon} + O(\lambda^3), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \mu^\epsilon \cdot \left(\lambda + \frac{N+8}{3\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^3) \right), \quad (4.5)$$

Here, we introduced a **momentum scale** μ for the **renormalized coupling constant** λ to be dimensionless. The scale dependence of λ can be seen through the **beta function** β_λ :

$$\beta_\lambda = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \log \mu} = -\epsilon \lambda + \frac{N+8}{3} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^3). \quad (4.6)$$

The theory becomes scale-independent and critical when the beta function vanishes $\beta_\lambda = 0$. Its trivial solution is $\lambda = 0$, which is uninteresting as the model is free and has no interacting degrees of freedom. One has a non-trivial zero of the beta function for $\lambda = \lambda_*$ with:

$$\frac{\lambda_*}{(4\pi)^2} \equiv \frac{3}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.7)$$

This interacting fixed point on the theory space of coupling constants is called the **Wilson-Fisher fixed point**. The **anomalous dimension** of the $O(N)$ vector field by Φ_1^α is denoted by γ_1 and can be computed as follows:

$$\gamma_1 = \left. \frac{\partial \log Z_1}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = \frac{N+2}{4(N+8)^2} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3). \quad (4.8)$$

We now comment on the relation between conformal dimension Δ_1 of the renormalized operator $W_1^\alpha(x)$ and anomalous dimension γ_1 of the bare operator Φ_1^α . From the relation (4.3), the two-point function of the bare operators is related to that of renormalized ones by:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle = Z_1^2 \cdot \langle W_1^\alpha(x_1) W_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_\lambda \quad (4.9)$$

Correlation functions of the bare operators should be independent of the momentum scale μ . Hence, we have:

$$\frac{d}{d \log \mu} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

leading to the **Callan-Symanzik equation** for general coupling constant λ :

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \log \mu} + \beta_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} + 2\gamma_1 \right) \cdot \langle W_1^\alpha(x_1) W_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_\lambda = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

At the critical point $\lambda = \lambda_*$, the beta function vanishes $\beta_{\lambda_*} = 0$ and one finds that:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \log \mu} + 2\gamma_1 \right) \cdot \langle W_1^\alpha(x_1) W_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Through performing the dimensional analysis and utilizing the Poincaré invariance of the theory for (4.9), we learn that the two-point function of the renormalized operators must behave as $|x_{12}|^{-2\Delta_1^{(0)}} f(|x_{12}|\mu)$ at criticality with $\Delta_1^{(0)} = d/2 - 1$ being the canonical (engineering) dimension of the bare operator $\Phi_1^\alpha(x)$. This observation leads to the following differential equation:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \log |x_{12}|} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \log \mu} + 2\Delta_1^{(0)} \right) \cdot \langle W_1^\alpha(x_1) W_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

From (4.12) and (4.13), it turns out that $f(|x_{12}|\mu) \propto (|x_{12}|\mu)^{-2\gamma_1}$ and:

$$\langle W_1^\alpha(x_1) W_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} \propto \frac{1}{|x_{12}|^{2(\Delta_1^{(0)} + \gamma_1)}}. \quad (4.14)$$

Comparing this expression with the general form of the scalar two-point functions in CFT (2.81), we conclude that:

$$\Delta_1 = \Delta_1^{(0)} + \gamma_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon + \frac{N+2}{4(N+8)^2}\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3). \quad (4.15)$$

This argument holds even for composite operators and can be generalized to the case with several coupling constants and to the models with boundaries and defects. In general, the conformal dimension $\Delta(W)$ of a renormalized operator W is the sum of the (engineering) canonical dimension $\Delta^{(0)}(\Phi)$ and the anomalous dimension $\gamma(\Phi)$ of the bare operator Φ :

$$\Delta(W) = \Delta^{(0)}(\Phi) + \gamma(\Phi), \quad \gamma(\Phi) = \frac{\partial \log Z(\Phi)}{\partial \log \mu} \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_*}, \quad (4.16)$$

where $Z(\Phi)$ is a wave-function renormalization of Φ determined for the two-point function of renormalized operators $\langle W W \rangle = Z(\Phi)^{-2} \cdot \langle \Phi \Phi \rangle$ to be finite.

For instance, consider the lowest-lying composite operator $\Phi_2 \equiv |\Phi_1|^2$ in free theory. Denoting its renormalized counterpart by $W_2 = Z_2 \cdot |\Phi_1|^2$, a standard perturbative calculation gives:

$$Z_2 = 1 - \frac{N+2}{3\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2). \quad (4.17)$$

And the conformal dimension of W_2 turns out to be:

$$\Delta_2 = d - 2 + \gamma_2 = 2 - \epsilon + \frac{N+2}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad \gamma_2 = \left. \frac{\partial \log Z_2}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*}. \quad (4.18)$$

Critical exponents such as specific heat C , magnetization $|\vec{m}|$ and susceptibility χ exponent are related to Δ_1 as well as Δ_2 through the relations:

$$\alpha = 2 - \frac{d}{d - \Delta_2}, \quad \beta = \frac{\Delta_1}{d - \Delta_2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{d - 2\Delta_1}{d - \Delta_2}, \quad (4.19)$$

with

$$C \sim |T - T_c|^{-\alpha}, \quad |\vec{m}| \sim |T - T_c|^\beta, \quad \chi \sim |T - T_c|^{-\gamma}, \quad \text{as } T \sim T_c, \quad (4.20)$$

where T_c is the critical temperature of the system.

4.2 Axioms for homogeneous critical systems

We then move to the axiomatic approach to the critical $O(N)$ model [RT15]. We here spell out their original axioms and methodology to study the homogeneous critical $O(N)$ model without resorting to the standard diagrammatic calculations.

The first axiom states that the theory at the fixed point has conformal symmetry and is described by CFT:

Axiom I. The theory at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point has conformal symmetry.

The second axiom follows from the intuition that the Wilson-Fisher conformal field theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions ($\epsilon \neq 0$) is smoothly connected to the free field theory in four dimensions ($\epsilon = 0$). It postulates the one-to-one correspondence between local operators in both theories:

Axiom II. For every local operator $\mathcal{O}_{\text{free}}$ in the free theory ($\epsilon = 0$), there exists a local operator at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point ($\epsilon \neq 0$), \mathcal{O}_{WF} , which tends to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{free}}$ in the free limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$: $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{O}_{\text{WF}} = \mathcal{O}_{\text{free}}$.

In what follows, we abuse notations to denote Wilson-Fisher theory counterparts of the free theory operators such as $\Phi_1^\alpha, \Phi_{2p} \equiv |\Phi_1|^{2p}$ and $\Phi_{2p+1}^\alpha \equiv \Phi_1^\alpha |\Phi_1|^{2p}$ in the same expressions as their renormalized counterparts in perturbation theory. Then, axiom II states that:

$$W_1^\alpha \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha, \quad W_{2p} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{2p}, \quad W_{2p+1}^\alpha \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{2p+1}^\alpha \quad (p = 1, 2, \dots). \quad (4.21)$$

Both free and Wilson-Fisher theories at criticality in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions fulfill the above two axioms. So, we must add one extra axiom to focus only on the Wilson-Fisher theory:

Axiom III. At the Wilson-Fisher fixed point, W_1^α and W_3^α are related by the following equation of motion:

$$\square W_1^\alpha(x) = \kappa \cdot W_3^\alpha(x) , \quad (4.22)$$

where \square is the Laplacian in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions.

The third axiom indicates that W_3^α is the descendant of W_1^α in the Wilson-Fisher theory. This recombination of conformal multiplet would not be the case in free theory in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions where these two operators are independent of each other. The coefficient κ is implicitly assumed to be non-zero for finite ϵ to make a distinction from free theory, and to vanish in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to reproduce the Klein-Gordon equation in four dimensions.

We now emphasize the difference between this axiomatic framework and the conventional perturbative calculations (see figure 4.1 for an illustration). Within the axiomatic framework, we compare the free theory in four dimensions with the Wilson-Fisher theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions, as we will explain in the rest of this section. On the other hand, the conventional approach performs perturbative expansion from the free theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions to access the Wilson-Fisher theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions as we described in section 4.1.

Rough sketch of Rychkov-Tan's strategy for anomalous dimensions. We now take a brief look at the machinery of Rychkov-Tan's axiomatic framework. Denoting the conformal dimensions of W_1^α , W_{2p} and W_{2p+1}^α by Δ_1 , Δ_{2p} and Δ_{2p+1} , we derive their leading non-trivial anomalous dimensions:

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{d-2}{2} + \gamma_1 , \quad \gamma_1 = \gamma_{1,1} \epsilon + \gamma_{1,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots , \quad (4.23)$$

$$\Delta_n = n \frac{d-2}{2} + \gamma_n , \quad \gamma_n = \gamma_{n,1} \epsilon + \gamma_{n,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots . \quad (4.24)$$

To do away with technical difficulties, we cut corners by assuming that the anomalous dimension of Φ_1^α starts from order ϵ^2 :

$$\gamma_{1,1} = 0 , \quad \gamma_{1,2} \neq 0 , \quad (4.25)$$

while the others from order ϵ .¹ Whenever we work in the axiomatic framework, we use a re-defined version of Φ_1^α :

$$\Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{new}} = 2\pi \cdot \Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{old}} , \quad (4.26)$$

so that the two-point function of Φ_1^α is unit-normalized in four dimensions (see (4.2) for canonical normalization under the action (4.1)):

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle|_{\lambda_0=0, d=4} = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_{12}|^2} . \quad (4.27)$$

¹One can show Φ_1^α has no anomalous dimension at order ϵ only from the axioms. This assumption is, of course, unnecessary, but without that, the calculations would get so involved that one cannot grasp the whole picture.




Figure 4.1: Illustrated is a schematic drawing to clarify the difference between the conventional perturbative approach and Rychkov-Tan's axiomatic approach. In the former approach, one starts from the free theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions and adds interactions perturbatively (vertical direction in this figure). By requiring the vanishing of the beta functions, one identifies the scale-invariant RG fixed point corresponding to the Wilson-Fisher theory and then explores various quantities there. On the other hand, in the axiomatic approach, we focus on the Wilson-Fisher theories on the green slope in this figure smoothly connected to the free theory in four dimensions. To investigate the Wilson-Fisher theory in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions, we expand every quantity in powers of ϵ along the green slope to make the most of the conformal symmetry.

We start by axiom I and focus our attention on the identity operator channel of the OPE of $W_1^{\alpha,2}$

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \times W_1^\beta(0) \supset c_1 \cdot \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^{2\Delta_1}} \cdot \mathbf{1}. \quad (4.28)$$

Here the coefficient should be $c_1 = 1 + O(\epsilon)$, since the OPE (4.28) reduces to the following expression when $\epsilon = 0$ (axiom II):

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) \times \Phi_1^\beta(0) \supset \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^2} \cdot \mathbf{1}. \quad (4.29)$$

From axiom III, one obtains the OPE of W_3^α by acting the Laplacian on both sides of (4.28):

$$\begin{aligned} W_3^\alpha(x) \times W_3^\beta(0) &\supset \frac{4 \Delta_1 (\Delta_1 + 1) (2\Delta_1 + 2 - d) (2\Delta_1 + 4 - d)}{\kappa^2} \cdot c_1 \cdot \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^{2\Delta_1+4}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ &= \frac{32 \epsilon^2 \gamma_{1,2} + O(\epsilon^3)}{\kappa^2} \cdot \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^{2\Delta_1+4}} \cdot \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

²See (2.64) for the generic form of the OPEs for primary operators in CFT

From Axiom II, this OPE should be equated to the following in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit:³

$$\Phi_3^\alpha(x) \times \Phi_3^\beta(0) \supset \frac{2(N+2)\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^6} \cdot \mathbf{1}. \quad (4.31)$$

As a result, we find that:

$$\kappa^2 = \frac{16}{N+2} \cdot \gamma_{1,2} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3). \quad (4.32)$$

We proceed to consider $W_1^\alpha(x)$ channel OPEs of the operators such as W_{2p} and W_{2p+1}^α . In particular, we pay attention to a few sub-leading terms and use axiom III to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2p}(x) \times W_{2p+1}^\alpha(0) &\supset \frac{c_{2p}}{|x|^{\Delta_{2p}+\Delta_{2p+1}-\Delta_1}} \cdot [1 + \dots + q_3^{(2p)} |x|^2 \square + \dots] \cdot W_1^\alpha(0) \\ &\supset \frac{c_{2p}}{|x|^{\Delta_{2p}+\Delta_{2p+1}-\Delta_1}} \cdot [W_1^\alpha(0) + \kappa q_3^{(2p)} |x|^2 W_3^\alpha(0)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2p+1}^\alpha(x) \times W_{2p+2}(0) &\supset \frac{c_{2p+1}}{|x|^{\Delta_{2p+1}+\Delta_{2p+2}-\Delta_1}} \cdot [1 + \dots + q_3^{(2p+1)} |x|^2 \square + \dots] \cdot W_1^\alpha(0) \\ &\supset \frac{c_{2p+1}}{|x|^{\Delta_{2p+1}+\Delta_{2p+2}-\Delta_1}} \cdot [W_1^\alpha(0) + \kappa q_3^{(2p+1)} |x|^2 \cdot W_3^\alpha(0)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

Here, two coefficients $q_3^{(2p)}$ and $q_3^{(2p+1)}$ are determined by conformal symmetry (see (2.64) and (2.67)). At the leading order in ϵ , we have:⁴

$$\kappa q_3^{(2p)} = \frac{\gamma_{2p+1,2} - \gamma_{2p,1}}{(N+2)\kappa} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^0), \quad (4.35)$$

$$\kappa q_3^{(2p+1)} = \frac{\gamma_{2p+2,2} - \gamma_{2p+1,1}}{(N+2)\kappa} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^0). \quad (4.36)$$

These two OPEs (equation (4.33) and (4.34)) tend to the following ones as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in respective ways:

$$\Phi_{2p}(x) \times \Phi_{2p+1}^\alpha(0) \supset \frac{2^{2p} p! (N/2)_p}{|x|^{4p}} \cdot \left(\Phi_1^\alpha(0) + \frac{3p}{N+2} |x|^2 \cdot \Phi_3^\alpha(0) \right), \quad (4.37)$$

and

$$\Phi_{2p+1}^\alpha(x) \times \Phi_{2p+2}(0) \supset \frac{2^{2p+1} (p+1)! (N/2)_p}{|x|^{4p+2}} \cdot \left(\Phi_1^\alpha(0) + \frac{6p+N+2}{2(N+2)} |x|^2 \cdot \Phi_3^\alpha(0) \right). \quad (4.38)$$

³One can calculate the free theory OPEs via Wick's theorem.

⁴Use (4.32) to obtain these two equations. Precisely, one must pay special attention to the case with $p = 1$. There, one cannot apply the formula (2.64) designed for primary operators as one of the operators in the left-hand side of (4.33) (and also (4.34)) turns into a descendant operator. However, careful analysis reveals that the recursion relations (4.39) hold as they stand even for $p = 1$. See the original paper [RT15] for details on this point.

Hence, we obtain the following recursion relations for anomalous dimensions:

$$\gamma_{2p+1,2} - \gamma_{2p,1} = 3p \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon), \quad (4.39)$$

$$\gamma_{2p+2,2} - \gamma_{2p+1,1} = \frac{6p + N + 2}{2} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon), \quad (4.40)$$

which can be solved under the initial condition $\gamma_{1,1} = 0$ (4.25) to give:

$$\gamma_{2p,1} = \frac{p(N + 6p - 4)}{2} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon), \quad \gamma_{2p+1,1} = \frac{p(N + 6p + 2)}{2} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon). \quad (4.41)$$

Now, all we have left is to determine κ . The last piece of the puzzle comes from the equation of motion in axiom III that implies:

$$\Delta_3 = \Delta_1 + 2 \quad \longrightarrow \quad \gamma_{3,1} = 1. \quad (4.42)$$

Combining this with (4.41), we are able to determine κ as:

$$\kappa = \frac{2}{N + 8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.43)$$

Plugging this into (4.32) and (4.41), we finally find that:

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{d - 2}{2} + \frac{N + 2}{4(N + 8)^2} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3), \quad (4.44)$$

$$\Delta_{2p} = 2p \cdot \frac{d - 2}{2} + \frac{p(N + 6p - 4)}{N + 8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (4.45)$$

$$\Delta_{2p+1} = (2p + 1) \cdot \frac{d - 2}{2} + \frac{p(N + 6p + 2)}{N + 8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.46)$$

These results agree with the perturbative results up to the first non-trivial order in ϵ . Similarly, one can compute leading anomalous dimensions of more generic operators such as $O(N)$ symmetric traceless tensors (see [RT15, section 4.2]).⁵

4.3 Axioms in the presence of a defect

In the presence of a defect, Rychkov-Tan's axioms are modified in the following manner [Yam16]:

Axiom I'. In the presence of a defect, the theory at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point has the **defect conformal symmetry**.

Axiom II'. For a bulk/defect local operator $\mathcal{O}_{\text{free}}/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{free}}$ in the free theory with a defect, there exists a local operator $\mathcal{O}_{\text{WF}}/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{WF}}$ at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point, which tends to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{free}}/\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{free}}$ in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

⁵According to the standard perturbative calculations, the anomalous dimensions of the broken conserved currents also start at the second order in ϵ [WK74, section 9]. One can deal with them within the axiomatic framework by considering the multiplet recombination phenomena just like Φ_1^α [GK16].

Axiom III'. At the Wilson-Fisher fixed point, **two bulk operators** W_1^α and W_3^α are related by the following equation of motion:

$$\square W_1^\alpha(x) = \kappa \cdot W_3^\alpha(x), \quad (4.47)$$

where \square is the Laplacian in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions.

In the presence of a defect, the assumption of conformal symmetry on the fixed point (axiom I) turns into that of defect conformal symmetry (axiom I'), making it possible to use DCFT techniques within this axiomatic framework. The second and the third axioms are almost unchanged. But take care that the one-to-one correspondence between operators in free ($\epsilon = 0$) and Wilson-Fisher theory ($\epsilon \neq 0$) is for both bulk and defect local operators. Because axiom I allows to use the bulk OPEs, one can do the same analysis as the last section. Hence, we still have the same bulk operator spectrum and κ as the case without defects (see e.g., (4.43) and (4.44)). The equation of motion (4.47) in axiom III' is only about bulk operators and says nothing about defect local operators. Nonetheless, our axioms are sufficient to extract information on the defect since the DOE bridges the bulk and defect CFT data.

The author of [Yam16] originally introduced these three modified axioms to explore a class of defect local non-composite operators on the co-dimension two monodromy defect of the critical Ising model in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions. It is straightforward to generalize his analysis to the $O(N)$ model [Söd17] and to the case with Neumann/Dirichlet boundary and interface [Söd17, GK20, DS20]. These three axioms, in particular the equation of motion (4.47), can be combined with the analytic conformal bootstrap, giving fine analytic studies of critical phenomena even in the presence of a defect where ordinary numerical bootstrap does not work [HS22b].

Let us clarify below what we will do in the following three chapters leveraging these three modified axioms. We will briefly review in section 6.3.1 and 7.3.1 how to study non-composite operators on Neumann and Dirichlet boundaries of the critical $O(N)$ model within the axiomatic framework. As one of the main results in this thesis, we will utilize modified axioms in section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 to derive the leading anomalous dimensions of non-composite operators on the line defect and the critical defect coupling in the critical $O(N)$ model.

As we argued in section 4.2, in the homogeneous critical systems, one can derive conformal dimensions of generic local operators, whichever they are composite or non-composite ones. With a defect, however, we found no research that deals with conformal dimensions of generic defect local composite operators within the axiomatic framework. In the rest of this thesis, we also demonstrate in the critical $O(N)$ model with three kinds of defects that it is possible to uncover defect local composite operator spectra using three modified axioms by focusing on the constraints coming from the analyticity of correlators. We expect that our analysis applies to other models and is enough to show the validity of the axiomatic approach.

Chapter 5

The $O(N)$ model with line defect

This chapter investigates the critical behavior of the $O(N)$ model with a line defect ($p = 1$) in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions using the axioms introduced in section 4.3. Section 5.1 reviews known perturbative studies by the authors of [AS14,CKM21] (section 5.1). We then reveal the structure of the free $O(N)$ model with a line defect in four dimensions (section 5.2). Based on the results, we take the axiomatic approach and reproduce the results in known literature (section 5.3). In particular, we invent a methodology to study conformal dimensions of composite operators by focusing on the analyticity of the correlators. We also study the defect operator spectrum for Ising DCFT ($N = 1$) in section 5.4.

5.1 Review of perturbative results

We consider the $O(N)$ model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions with a line defect ($p = 1$) extending along the first axis \hat{x}_1 .¹ The total bare action of this model is the bulk action I_{bulk} ($= I$ in (4.1)) plus the defect localized action I_{defect} .²

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{tot}} &= I_{\text{bulk}} + I_{\text{defect}} \\ &= \int d^d x \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial\Phi_1|^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} |\Phi_1|^4 \right) - h_0 \int d\hat{x}^1 \Phi_1^1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

We first present perturbative results according to [AS14,CKM21]. See also [GGLLv22, section 3.2] for a nice and concise review.

One renormalizes the bulk fields and the bulk coupling constant to have the same results as

¹We here would like to stress that, even in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions, we fix the dimension of the defect to one, as we eventually aim to access the critical $O(N)$ in three dimensions with a line defect by taking the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$.

²Notice that we put a minus sign in the localized magnetic field relatively to [CKM21] $h_0|_{\text{here}} = -h_0|_{\text{there}}$.

without defects (see section 4.1):

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) = Z_1 \cdot W_1^\alpha(x), \quad (5.2)$$

$$Z_1 = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^4} \cdot \frac{N+2}{36\epsilon} + O(\lambda^3), \quad (5.3)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \mu^\epsilon \cdot \left(\lambda + \frac{N+8}{3\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^3) \right). \quad (5.4)$$

On the other hand, the defect coupling is renormalized so that the bulk one-point function of the bare operator $\Phi_1^\alpha(x)$ is finite:³

$$h_0 = \mu^{\epsilon/2} \cdot \left(h + \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{h^3}{12\epsilon} + O(\lambda^2) \right). \quad (5.5)$$

The beta functions for renormalized bulk and defect coupling constants are:

$$\beta_\lambda = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \log \mu} = -\epsilon \lambda + \frac{N+8}{3} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^3), \quad (5.6)$$

$$\beta_h = \frac{\partial h}{\partial \log \mu} = -\frac{\epsilon}{2} h + \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{h^3}{6} + O(\lambda^2). \quad (5.7)$$

They vanish non-trivially when $(\lambda, h) = (\lambda_*, h_*)$ with:

$$\frac{\lambda_*}{(4\pi)^2} = \frac{3}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.8)$$

$$h_*^2 = N+8 + O(\epsilon). \quad (5.9)$$

We refer to this point in the parameter space as the Wilson-Fisher fixed point in the presence of a line defect.

Next, let us focus on the anomalous dimensions of the local operators. Because the bulk operators are insensitive to the defect coupling, their anomalous dimensions take the same values as those without defects. Meanwhile, the defect local operators are affected by the defect and behave differently from bulk ones. One naturally classifies defect local operators according to the following enhanced symmetry group on the critical point:

$$\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \text{SO}(d-1) \times \text{O}(N-1). \quad (5.10)$$

The first two correspond to the defect conformal group, which is a direct product of the parallel conformal group and the transverse rotation group. The defect localized action I_{defect} breaks the

³As explained in the next section, the bulk one-point function of $\Phi_1^\alpha(x)$ does not vanish in free theory and is proportional to the defect coupling h (see equation (5.30)). Although we already know the bulk coupling λ is of order ϵ at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point, we have no idea about the defect coupling h at criticality. Hence, we should expand the defect coupling to all orders for every fixed order in λ .

bulk $O(N)$ symmetry down to its subgroup $O(N - 1)$. The authors of [CKM21] based on the representation theory of (5.10) and derived conformal dimensions of the low-lying defect local operators through conventional perturbative calculations as specified below.

First, consider the lowest-lying defect local operators defined by the limiting form when no interactions are present ($\lambda_0 = 0$):

$$\widehat{\Phi}_1^1(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^1(x), \quad \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^{\hat{\alpha}}(x). \quad (5.11)$$

Here $\widehat{\Phi}_1^1$ is singlet both in $SO(d - 1)$ and $O(N - 1)$, whereas $\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$ is in the vector representation of $O(N - 1)$. Denoting their renormalized counterparts by $\widehat{W}_1^1 = \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^1) \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_1^1$ and $\widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}} = \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}) \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$, their wave function renormalizations are calculated as follows:

$$\widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^1) = 1 - \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{h^2}{4\epsilon} + O(\lambda^2), \quad \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}) = 1 - \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot \frac{h^2}{12\epsilon} + O(\lambda^2). \quad (5.12)$$

According to the formula (4.16), these expressions lead to the following conformal dimensions of the renormalized operators:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^1) = d/2 - 1 + \widehat{\gamma}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^1) = 1 + \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad \widehat{\gamma}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^1) = \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^1)}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\substack{\lambda=\lambda_* \\ h=h_*}} \quad (5.13)$$

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}) = d/2 - 1 + \widehat{\gamma}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}) = 1 + O(\epsilon^2), \quad \widehat{\gamma}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}) = \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}})}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\substack{\lambda=\lambda_* \\ h=h_*}}. \quad (5.14)$$

One can identify $\widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$ as the tilt operator (3.11) associated with the symmetry breaking from $O(N)$ to $O(N - 1)$.⁴ The calculations performed by the authors of [CKM21] are at one-loop level, but we expect the conformal dimension of $\widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$ to remain unity at all orders in ϵ .

Next, let us proceed to the defect local operators in the vector representation of $SO(d - 1)$:

$$\widehat{U}_i^1(\hat{x}) \equiv \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_{2,i}^1) \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_i^2(\hat{x}), \quad \widehat{\Phi}_{2,i}^1(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \partial_i \widehat{\Phi}_i^1(x), \quad (5.15)$$

$$\widehat{U}_i^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}) \equiv \widehat{Z}(\widehat{\Phi}_{2,i}^{\hat{\alpha}}) \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_{2,i}^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}), \quad \widehat{\Phi}_{2,i}^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \partial_i \widehat{\Phi}_i^{\hat{\alpha}}(x). \quad (5.16)$$

According to [CKM21], their conformal dimensions are given by:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_{s=1}^1) = 2 + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.17)$$

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_{s=1}^{\hat{\alpha}}) = 2 - \frac{1}{3}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.18)$$

The latter operator $\widehat{U}_{s=1}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ can be identified as the displacement operator having protected conformal dimension two (see equation (3.9)). In section 5.3.2, we will take one step further in axiomatic

⁴In this case, symmetry breaking currents in free theory are $J_\mu^{1\hat{\alpha}} = \Phi_1^1 \partial_\mu \Phi_1^{\hat{\alpha}} - \Phi_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \partial_\mu \Phi_1^1$.

framework and consider operators in the symmetric and traceless representation of $SO(d - 1)$ $\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^1$ and $\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}$, tending to:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_{1+s, i_1 \dots i_s}^1(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \partial_{(i_1} \dots \partial_{i_s)} \widehat{\Phi}_i^1(x), \quad (5.19)$$

$$\widehat{\Phi}_{1+s, i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \partial_{(i_1} \dots \partial_{i_s)} \widehat{\Phi}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}(x), \quad (5.20)$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The structure of the second-order defect composite operators is a little involved. According to the classification (5.10), their bare operators fall into the three classes:⁵

$$\widehat{\Phi}_1^1 \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^1 \Phi_1^{\hat{\gamma}}(x), \quad \widehat{\Phi}_1^{(\hat{\alpha} \hat{\beta})}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^{(\hat{\gamma} \hat{\sigma})}(x), \quad (5.21)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^1 \Phi_1^1(x) \\ |\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}|^2(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\hat{\gamma}=2}^N \Phi_1^{\hat{\gamma}} \Phi_1^{\hat{\gamma}}(x) \end{cases}. \quad (5.22)$$

The first operator in (5.21) is in the vector representation of $O(N - 1)$, whereas the second is a symmetric and traceless tensor of rank-two. The conformal dimensions of their renormalized counterparts $\widehat{V}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ and $\widehat{T}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ are given by:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{V}) = 2 + \frac{N + 10}{N + 8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.23)$$

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{T}) = 2 + \frac{2}{N + 8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.24)$$

Two $O(N - 1)$ singlet operators (5.22) are degenerate in free theory ($\lambda_0 = 0$). However, once the interaction is turned on, such degeneracy is resolved due to the bulk interaction term to form a new set of operators \widehat{S}^{\pm} having the following conformal dimensions:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{S}^{\pm}) = 2 + \frac{3N + 20 \pm \sqrt{N^2 + 40N + 320}}{2(N + 8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.25)$$

5.2 Structure of free $O(N)$ model in four dimensions with a line defect

We now perform a detailed analysis of the four-dimensional free $O(N)$ model with a line defect. The case with $N = 1$ is partially analyzed in [Kap05] and [BGLM16, section 5.4] such as one- and two-point functions of non-composite fields. We extend their analysis to get all the information necessary for our purpose. We first study correlation functions in section 5.2.1. We then utilize the free DCFT correlators to uncover the DOEs of Φ_1^{α} and Φ_3^{α} in section 5.2.2.

⁵Note that $\widehat{\Phi}_1^1 \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_1^{(\hat{\alpha} \hat{\beta})}$ make sense only for $N \geq 2$ and $N \geq 3$ respectively. Also, in case of $N = 1$ (Ising model) we fail to define $|\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}|^2$.

5.2.1 Correlation functions

With the redefined version of the $O(N)$ vector field (4.26) $\Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{new}} = 2\pi \cdot \Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{old}}$, we rewrite the action of the free model by:

$$I_{\text{tot,free}} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int d^4x |\partial\Phi_1|^2 - \frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{x}^1 \Phi_1^1. \quad (5.26)$$

As the defect coupling h is marginal, this model is described by DCFT at any value of h . We denote the correlation functions in the absence of the defect by $\langle \cdots \rangle_0$, which we compute by the following path-integral (see also (2.36)):

$$\langle \cdots \rangle_0 \equiv \int \mathcal{D}\Phi_1(\cdots) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int d^4x |\partial\Phi_1|^2\right). \quad (5.27)$$

The two-point function of Φ_1^α are unit-normalized under this normalization:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle_0 = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^2}. \quad (5.28)$$

Let us define the DCFT correlators $\langle \cdots \rangle$ by:

$$\langle \cdots \rangle \equiv \frac{\langle \cdots e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0}{\langle e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0}, \quad (5.29)$$

by identifying $e^{-I_{\text{defect}}} = e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1}$ with the defect operator $\mathcal{D}^{(p=1)}$ in line with (3.37). The bulk one-point function of Φ_1^α does not vanish in the presence of the defect and is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \rangle &= \frac{\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0}{\langle e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0} \\ &= \frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \Phi_1^1(\hat{y}) \rangle_0 \\ &= \frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1}}{|x - \hat{y}|^2} \\ &= \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} \hat{h}}{|x_\perp|}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

In deriving this, we contracted Φ_1^α with the defect operator $e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1}$ using Wick's theorem, and introduced \hat{h} to shorten equations:

$$\hat{h} \equiv \frac{h}{2}. \quad (5.31)$$

The bulk two-point functions of Φ_1^α are calculated in the similar fashion:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle &= \frac{\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0}{\langle e^{\frac{h}{2\pi} \int d\hat{y}^1 \Phi_1^1} \rangle_0} \\ &= \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle + \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle_0 \\ &= \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta 1} \hat{h}^2}{|x_{1,\perp}| |x_{2,\perp}|} + \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

This immediately leads to the two-point functions involving $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x)$:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}|^2}, \quad \langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^2}. \quad (5.33)$$

Note that, to compute the bulk-defect two-point function $\langle \Phi_1^\alpha \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta \rangle$, we have taken the limit $|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0$ inside correlators so that they are finite and compatible with defect conformal symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{x}_2) \rangle &= \lim_{|x_{2,\perp}| \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta 1} \hat{h}^2}{|x_{1,\perp}| |x_{2,\perp}|} + \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - \hat{x}_2|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

Consider defect local operators having transverse spin indices:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s} = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \partial^{(i_1} \dots \partial^{i_s)} \Phi_1^\alpha. \quad (5.35)$$

To compute their correlation functions, we start by acting derivatives to transverse directions on one of the operators in the left-hand side of (5.32):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial^{(i_1} \dots \partial^{i_s)} \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle &= (-2)^s s! \cdot \frac{x_{\perp,12}^{(i_1} \dots x_{\perp,12}^{i_s)}}{|x_{12}|^{2(s+1)}} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad + (\text{singular terms in } |x_{1,\perp}|), \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

By taking $|x_{1,\perp}| \rightarrow 0$ and subtracting divergences, we find that:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}) \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle = 2^s s! \cdot \frac{x_{\perp}^{(i_1} \dots x_{\perp}^{i_s)}}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2(s+1)}} \delta^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (5.37)$$

From this result, it is straightforward to derive the two-point function of $\widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s}$:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\beta, j_1 \dots j_s}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = 2^s (s!)^2 \cdot \frac{\delta_{j_1}^{(i_1} \dots \delta_{j_s}^{i_s)}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{2(s+1)}} \delta^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (5.38)$$

Wick's theorem allows us to calculate all the correlators of our interest from the ones derived up to this point. For instance, the bulk one-point function $\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \rangle$ and the bulk-defect two-point function $\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle$ are computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \rangle &= \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle \\ &= \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} \hat{h}^3}{|x_\perp|^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle &= \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\gamma(x) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\gamma(x) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2 \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma(\hat{y}) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle \cdot \langle \Phi_1^\gamma(x) \rangle \\ &= \frac{\hat{h}^2 (1 + 2 \delta^{\alpha 1}) \delta^{\alpha \beta}}{|x - \hat{y}|^2 |x_\perp|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.40)$$

Provided (5.37) and (5.30), some calculations similar to the above result in the following bulk-defect two-point functions involving $\widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s}$:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1}^{\alpha, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{y}) \Phi_3^\beta(x) \rangle = \hat{h}^2 (1 + 2 \delta^{\alpha 1}) 2^s s! \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{(i_1 \dots i_s)}}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2(s+1)}} \delta^{\alpha \beta}. \quad (5.41)$$

Our further interests are in the correlation functions involving the following operators:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_3^\alpha(x), \quad (5.42)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Phi}_2 \in \left\{ |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}|^2, \widehat{\Phi}_1^1 \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}, \widehat{\Phi}_1^{(\hat{\gamma} \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\sigma}})} \right\}. \quad (5.43)$$

We here note the following correlators including $\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha$:

$$\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_3^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{2(N+2)}{|x - \hat{y}|^6} \delta^{\alpha \beta}, \quad \langle \widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_3^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{2(N+2)}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^6} \delta^{\alpha \beta}. \quad (5.44)$$

In addition, we will make heavy use of the following defect three-point functions and bulk-defect-defect three-point functions concerning $\widehat{\Phi}_2$ in our analysis:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\hat{y}_2) \rangle &= \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2| |\hat{y}_{12}|^2}, \\ \langle \widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\hat{y}_2) \rangle &= \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^2 |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^4}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

and

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^2}, \quad (5.46)$$

$$\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{(1 + 2 \delta^{\alpha 1}) \hat{h}^2 c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^2 |x_\perp|^2} + \frac{c(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|x - \hat{y}_1|^2 |x - \hat{y}_2|^4}, \quad (5.47)$$

Here, the defect three-point coefficients $c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$ and $c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$ are listed in table 5.1.

$\widehat{\Phi}_2$	$c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$	$c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$
$ \widehat{\Phi}_1 ^2$	$2\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta 1}$	$2\delta^{\alpha\beta} + 4\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta 1}$
$ \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}} ^2$	$2\delta^{\alpha\beta} - 2\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta 1}$	$2(N+1)\delta^{\alpha\beta} - 4\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta 1}$
$\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}$	$\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta\hat{\gamma}} + \delta^{\beta 1}\delta^{\alpha\hat{\gamma}}$	$2(\delta^{\alpha 1}\delta^{\beta\hat{\gamma}} + \delta^{\beta 1}\delta^{\alpha\hat{\gamma}})$
$\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\sigma}}$	$2\delta^{\alpha(\hat{\gamma}\hat{\sigma})\beta}$	$4\delta^{\alpha(\hat{\gamma}\hat{\sigma})\beta}$

Table 5.1: List of defect three-point coefficients involving second-order composite operators (5.43). See equation (5.45) for the expressions of defect three-point functions.

5.2.2 Defect operator expansions

According to section 3.5, we now write down the DOEs of two bulk local operators Φ_1^α and Φ_3^α from the correlation functions derived in the last section.

Defect operator expansion of Φ_1^α . The DOE of Φ_1^α is given by the expression:

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) = \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1}\hat{h}}{|x_\perp|} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s!} \cdot x_\perp^{(i_1} \cdots x_\perp^{i_s)} \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1, i_1 \cdots i_s}^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) \quad (5.48)$$

Because the free $O(N)$ vector is just an n -copies of the Klein-Gordon field, the defect primaries appearing in its DOE are as anticipated in section 3.6.

Defect operator expansion of Φ_3^α . It is clear from the one- and two-point functions involving Φ_3^α (see section 5.2.1) that the DOE of Φ_3^α contains $\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha$, as well as the same defect primaries as those that appear in the DOE of Φ_1^α (5.48). But this is not the end of the story, and there are additional contributions to the DOE of Φ_3^α . Relevant terms in our analysis are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \supset & \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1}\hat{h}^3}{|x_\perp|^3} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{(1+2\delta^{\alpha 1})\hat{h}^2}{|x_\perp|^2} \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) \\ & + \frac{(1+2\delta^{\alpha 1})\hat{h}^2}{|x_\perp|^2} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s!} \cdot x_\perp^{(i_1} \cdots x_\perp^{i_s)} \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_{s+1, i_1 \cdots i_s}^\alpha(\hat{x}) \\ & + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} \cdot |x_\perp|^{2n} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha(\hat{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

where the coefficients appearing in the last line fulfill the conditions:

$$\frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha) c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} = c(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) \cdot \frac{(-1)^n (2)_n}{(n+5/2)_n}. \quad (5.50)$$

One can confirm above expressions by looking at the bulk-defect-defect three-point functions $\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\hat{y}_2) \rangle$ given in equation (5.47), as explained below. By setting $(\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \mapsto (0, \infty)$, we find the following conformal block expansions:⁶

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(0) \widehat{\Phi}_2(\infty) \rangle &= \frac{(1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}) \hat{h}^2 c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|x_\perp|^2} + \frac{c(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{|x|^2} \\ &= \frac{|x|}{|x_\perp|^3} \cdot \left[(1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}) \hat{h}^2 c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) \cdot G_1^{-1}(v) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (2)_n}{(n + 5/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+3}^{-1}(v) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

with $v = |x_\perp|^2/|x|^2$. In deriving this, we employed the hypergeometric identity (A.2) and:

$$G_1^{-1}(v) = v^{1/2}, \quad G_{2n+3}^{-1}(v) = v^{n+3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1(1+n, 2+n; 7/2+2n; v). \quad (5.52)$$

We learn from (5.51) that an infinite number of defect primaries having odd integer conformal dimensions $(2n+3)$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) appear in the DOE of Φ_3^α , which we denote by $\widehat{O}_{2n+3}^\alpha$. It is worthwhile noting that \widehat{O}_3^α can be identified with $\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha$, and $\widehat{O}_{2n+3}^\alpha$ ($n \geq 1$) is some composite operator in the vector representation of $O(N)$ made out from three $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$'s and $2n$ parallel derivatives $\hat{\partial}^a$. By comparing (5.51) with (3.69), we conclude (5.49) and (5.50).⁷

5.3 DCFT data on the line defect

We make the most of the modified Rychkov-Tan's axioms introduced in section 4.3 to reproduce the perturbative results reviewed in section 5.1. As a warm-up, we start with the critical defect coupling and conformal dimensions of non-composite operators in section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2. We then move to composite ones. There are little twists and turns in the case of composite operators, but we demonstrate here that our framework works well when combined with the analyticity of Euclidean correlators (Schwinger functions) postulated a-priori in any Euclidean QFTs.

⁶The defect local primaries at the infinity is defined in (3.68).

⁷It is possible to perform a similar analysis for the bulk-defect-defect three-point function $\langle \Phi_3^\alpha \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta \widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(0) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma(\infty) \rangle &= \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta \gamma} \hat{h}^3}{|x_\perp|^3} + \frac{2\hat{h}(\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta \gamma} + \delta^{\beta 1} \delta^{\alpha \gamma} + \delta^{\gamma 1} \delta^{\alpha \beta})}{|x_\perp| \cdot |x|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^3} \cdot \left[\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta \gamma} \hat{h}^3 \cdot G_0^0(v) + 2\hat{h}(\delta^{\alpha 1} \delta^{\beta \gamma} + \delta^{\beta 1} \delta^{\alpha \gamma} + \delta^{\gamma 1} \delta^{\alpha \beta}) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n n!}{(n + 3/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+2}^0(v) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

This conformal block expansion implies that there are further contributions to the DOE of Φ_3^α coming from $\widehat{\Phi}_2 \equiv |\widehat{\Phi}_1|^2$ and a tower of operators with even integer conformal dimensions, consisting of two $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$'s and even numbers of parallel derivatives $\hat{\partial}^a$. However, such operators are irrelevant in our analysis and ignored afterward, as they come into play at order ϵ^2 .

5.3.1 Lowest-lying defect local operator and critical defect coupling

Let us derive the conformal dimensions of the lowest-lying defect local operators $(\widehat{W}_1^1, \widehat{W}_1^{\hat{\alpha}})$ and the critical defect coupling \hat{h} . Owing to axiom **I'**, the theory at the fixed point is described by DCFT. Hence, the DOE of $W_1^\alpha(x)$ is fixed by the defect conformal symmetry to have the form:

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \supset C_0^\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1}} \cdot \mathbf{1} + C_1^\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}). \quad (5.54)$$

Axiom **II'** states that this DOE (5.54) should reduce to (5.48) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. As a result, we have:

$$C_1^\alpha = 1 + O(\epsilon), \quad C_0^\alpha = \delta^{\alpha 1} \hat{h} + O(\epsilon). \quad (5.55)$$

Employing the equation of motion in axiom **III'**, one can deduce the DOE of W_3^α from (5.54):⁸

$$\begin{aligned} W_3^\alpha(x) \supset & \frac{C_0^\alpha}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{\Delta_1 (\Delta_1 - 1 + \epsilon)}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 + 2}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ & + \frac{C_1^\alpha}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{[\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon]}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) + 2}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

Because this DOE should be identical to (5.49) from axiom **II'**, one obtains the following equations:

$$\hat{h}^3 \kappa = \hat{h} \Delta_1 (\Delta_1 - 1 + \epsilon) + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.57)$$

$$(1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}) \hat{h}^2 \kappa = [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon] + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.58)$$

We can solve these two equations by exploiting the values of two bulk quantities κ (4.43) and Δ_1 (4.44) to find that:

$$\hat{h}^2 = \frac{N + 8}{4} + O(\epsilon) \xrightarrow{(5.31) \quad \hat{h}=h/2} h^2 = N + 8 + O(\epsilon), \quad (5.59)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) &= \Delta_1 + \frac{1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}}{2} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= 1 + \epsilon \delta^{\alpha 1} + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

These are in agreement with the perturbative results (5.9), (5.13) and (5.14).

For those who wonder if it is not sufficient to look at the leading behavior of the DOE for small $|x_\perp|$, we here verify our result (5.60) all orders in $|x_\perp|$ by considering the bulk-defect two-point function:

$$\langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta)}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)} |x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)}}, \quad (5.61)$$

⁸Use (3.78) to evaluate the action of the Laplace differential operator.

with $b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta) = \delta^{\alpha\beta} + O(\epsilon)$. Let us apply the equation of motion (4.47) to this expression using the formula for the Laplace differential operator $\square_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}$ in the presence of a p -dimensional defect:

$$\square_x \left(\frac{1}{|x|^a |x_\perp|^b} \right) = \frac{a(a+2b+2-d)}{|x|^{a+2} |x_\perp|^b} + \frac{b(b+2+p-d)}{|x|^a |x_\perp|^{b+2}}. \quad (5.62)$$

Then we we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle &= \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta)}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{2\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) \cdot [2\Delta_1 - 2 + \epsilon]}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)+2} |x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)}} \\ &+ \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta)}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{[\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon]}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)} |x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)+2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.63)$$

The first term in the right-hand side of (5.63) vanishes in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ since its coefficient is of order ϵ :

$$\frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta)}{\kappa} \cdot 2\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) \cdot [2\Delta_1 - 2 + \epsilon] = O(\epsilon). \quad (5.64)$$

On the other hand, the coefficient in the second term is finite even after setting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta)}{\kappa} \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon] \\ = \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{N+8}{4} \cdot (1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}) + O(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (5.65)$$

Hence, when $\epsilon = 0$, the bulk-defect two-point function (5.63) reduces to:

$$\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{\hat{h}^2 (1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}) \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}|^2 |x_\perp|^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{h}^2 = \frac{N+8}{4}, \quad (5.66)$$

in agreement with the free theory analysis (5.40). Therefore, our result is consistent with defect conformal symmetry to all orders in $|x_\perp|$.

5.3.2 Defect local operators with transverse spin indices

The defect local operators with transverse spin indices $\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^1$ and $\widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ appear in the DOE of W_1^α in the following manner (axiom Γ):⁹

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \supset C_s^\alpha \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{(i_1 \dots i_s)}}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) + s}} \cdot \widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^\alpha(\hat{x}), \quad (5.67)$$

⁹The result in this section has some overlaps with [GHK22, Appendix C] that appeared shortly before our original paper [NOS22a].

with $C_s^\alpha = 1/s! + O(\epsilon)$ from (5.48) (axiom II'). From axiom III' and (3.78), one has:

$$W_3^\alpha(x) \supset \frac{C_s^\alpha}{\kappa} \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) + s] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) - s - 1 + \epsilon] \cdot \frac{x_\perp^{(i_1 \dots i_s)}}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) + s + 2}} \cdot \widehat{U}_{i_1 \dots i_s}^\alpha(\hat{x}). \quad (5.68)$$

Comparing this with (5.49) in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit (axiom II'), we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) &= \Delta_1 + s + \frac{1 + 2\delta^{\alpha 1}}{2(s+2)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= s + 1 + \frac{2\delta^{\alpha 1} - s - 1}{2(s+2)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.69)$$

This result agrees with the perturbative calculations for $s = 1$ and also with the limiting behavior of defect local operators $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{U}_s^\alpha) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_1 + s$ predicted by the analytic defect conformal bootstrap [LLMS17, section 2.1].

5.3.3 Composite defect local operators

We now derive the conformal dimensions of the following defect composite operators:

$$\widehat{W}_2 \in \left\{ \widehat{V}^{\hat{\alpha}}, \widehat{T}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}, \widehat{S}_+, \widehat{S}_- \right\}, \quad (5.70)$$

tending to free theory ones listed in (5.43) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. As a remainder, we note that in taking the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ $\widehat{V}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ and $\widehat{T}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ become $\widehat{\Phi}_1^1 \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_1^{(\hat{\alpha}} \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\beta})}$ respectively, while \widehat{S}^\pm turn into some linear combinations of $|\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2$ and $|\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}|^2$. Without loss of generality, we make such that \widehat{S}^\pm are unit-normalized and orthogonal to each other in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ by introducing the mixing angle θ :

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{S}_+ \\ \widehat{S}_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(N-1)}} \cdot |\widehat{\Phi}_1^{\hat{\gamma}}|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.71)$$

Because composite operators do not appear in the DOE of $\Phi_1^\alpha(x)$ in the free theory ($\epsilon = 0$), we cannot use the same approach as the last two subsections. Instead, we take the following strategy to tackle the problem:

- We calculate the DOE of W_1 up to the first order in ϵ utilizing the equation of motion (4.47).
- Thereby, we investigate the following bulk-defect-defect three-point function:

$$\langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_1^\beta(0) \widehat{W}_2(\infty) \rangle \quad (5.72)$$

- The correlator turns out to be non-analytic along $|\hat{x}| = 0$ where any pairs of operators do not coincide, in contradiction to the analyticity of Euclidean correlators away from the coincidence of points [OS73, OS75]. Requiring non-analytic terms to vanish at order ϵ , we obtain constraints on the conformal dimensions.¹⁰

Defect operator expansion of W_1^α . In the free theory ($\epsilon = 0$), the Klein-Gordon equation severely constrains the DOE of $W_1^\alpha = \Phi_1^\alpha$ to take the form given in (5.48). In the Wilson-Fisher theory ($\epsilon \neq 0$), however, other operators can appear in the DOE of W_1^α , whose contributions relevant in our analysis at order ϵ are as follows:¹¹

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \supset \frac{C_1^\alpha}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(W_1^\alpha)}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) / c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}} \cdot \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha(\hat{x}). \quad (5.73)$$

Here, the defect local operator appearing in above expression $\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) has conformal dimension $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) = 2n + 3 + O(\epsilon)$ and is identical with $\widehat{O}_{2n+3}{}^\alpha$ that appears in the DOE of Φ_3^α (5.49) when $\epsilon = 0$. The DOE coefficients are subject to the following relations:

$$\frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} = \frac{\epsilon}{(N+8)(n+1)(2n+3)} \cdot \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{O}_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{O}_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.74)$$

To derive the relation for DOE coefficients (5.74), we first apply the equation of motion (4.47) to the DOE of W_1^α (5.73):

$$W_3^\alpha(x) \supset \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{\kappa \cdot c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} \cdot \frac{[\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon]}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) + 2}} \cdot \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha(\hat{x}). \quad (5.75)$$

Due to axiom III', this DOE should reduce to the expression given in (5.49) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then, we compare (5.75) with (5.49), while substituting κ (4.43), to conclude (5.74).

Study of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions involving W_1^α . It follows from the DOE of W_1^α (5.73) and the generic form of the conformal block expansion (3.68) that the three-point

¹⁰We comment that the analyticity of bulk-defect-defect three-point correlators are firstly used [LLVRZ20] to argue the triviality of defect operator spectrum when the bulk scalar field is free, and subsequently for free Maxwell theory in [HS22a]. The authors of [BDPLVR20, BDPLvR21] applied a similar idea for bulk-bulk-boundary three-point functions. See also [LMvR23] for a related subject.

¹¹Similarly, a tower of operators having even integer conformal dimensions when $\epsilon = 0$ should appear according to footnote 7 in section 5.2.2. But we here neglect them, as they are irrelevant in our analysis restricted to the first order in ϵ .

function $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_1^\beta \widehat{W}_2 \rangle$ takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_1^\beta(0) \widehat{W}_2(\infty) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}} \cdot \left[C_1^\alpha \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta, \widehat{W}_2) \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)}^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}(v) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}) c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}, \widehat{W}_1^\beta, \widehat{W}_2)}{c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3})} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3})}^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}(v) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.76)$$

with $v = |x_\perp|^2/|x|^2$. One can expand the first term in the parenthesis in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} & G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)}^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}(v) \\ &= v^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)/2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} + \delta^{\beta 1} - \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2)}{2}, 1; \frac{3}{2}; v\right) + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= v^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha)/2} + \frac{\delta^{\alpha 1} + \delta^{\beta 1} - \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2)}{3} \epsilon \cdot v^{3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1(1, 1; 5/2; v) + O(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (5.77)$$

where we used (5.60) and (3.66), and introduced $\widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2)$ by the relation:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2) = 2 + \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2) \cdot \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.78)$$

Meanwhile, with the aid of the hypergeometric summation formula (A.5) and two identities concerning DOE coefficients (5.74) and (5.50), the second term becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}) c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}, \widehat{W}_1^\beta, \widehat{W}_2)}{c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3})} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3})}^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}(v) \\ &= \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{3(N+8)} \epsilon \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n n!}{(2n/3+1)(n+5/2)_n} \cdot v^{n+3/2} \\ & \quad \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{n+1, n+2}{2n+7/2}; v\right) + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)}{3(N+8)} \epsilon \cdot v^{3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1(1, 1; 5/2; v) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.79)$$

Combining these two expressions with the relation $C_1^\alpha \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta, \widehat{W}_2) = c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) + O(\epsilon)$, we are able to evaluate the three-point function $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_1^\beta \widehat{W}_2 \rangle$ up to the first order in ϵ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_1^\beta(0) \widehat{W}_2(\infty) \rangle \\ &= C_1^\alpha \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_1^\beta, \widehat{W}_2) \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta)} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha) + \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_1^\beta) - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2)}} \\ & \quad + \frac{\epsilon}{3(N+8)} \cdot \left\{ (N+8) \cdot [\delta^{\alpha 1} + \delta^{\beta 1} - \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2)] \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) + c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) \right\} \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(1, 1; \frac{5}{2}; \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2}\right) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.80)$$

Constraint from analyticity. According to Osterwalder-Schrader axioms [OS73, OS75] that one postulates in any Euclidean QFTs, Euclidean QFT correlators must be analytic if any pairs of operators are away from each other. In taking the limit $\hat{x} \rightarrow 0$, the second term in three-point function $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_1^\beta \widehat{W}_2 \rangle$ (5.80) turns out to be non-analytic due to odd integer powers of $|\hat{x}|$:

$${}_2F_1 \left(1, 1; \frac{5}{2}; \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2} \right) \xrightarrow{\hat{x} \sim 0} \frac{3\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{|\hat{x}|}{|x|} + \dots, \quad (5.81)$$

as clear from Kummer's connection formula for Gauss's hypergeometric function (A.1). The only way to resolve this non-analyticity is to require that:

$$(N+8) \cdot [\delta^{\alpha 1} + \delta^{\beta 1} - \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_2)] \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) + c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2) = 0, \quad (5.82)$$

with $c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$ and $c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_2)$ being the defect three-point coefficients listed in table 5.1. By solving this constraint, one immediately finds that the conformal dimensions of the $O(N)$ vector field $\widehat{V}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ and the rank-two symmetric and traceless tensor $\widehat{T}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ are given as follows:

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\widehat{V}} = 2 + \frac{N+10}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.83)$$

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\widehat{T}} = 2 + \frac{2}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.84)$$

in agreement with perturbative results (5.23) and (5.24). For the conformal dimensions of \widehat{S}^\pm , we have to solve the following simultaneous linear equations with three unknowns $\widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{S}^\pm)$, θ with $\Gamma_{\widehat{S}_+} \geq \Gamma_{\widehat{S}_-}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (N+8) \cdot (\Gamma_{\widehat{S}_+} - \delta^{\alpha 1} - \delta^{\beta 1}) \cdot [\sqrt{N-1} \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2) - \tan \theta \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma|^2)] \\ = \sqrt{N-1} \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2) - \tan \theta \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma|^2), \\ (N+8) \cdot (\Gamma_{\widehat{S}_-} - \delta^{\alpha 1} - \delta^{\beta 1}) \cdot [\sqrt{N-1} \cdot \tan \theta \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2) + c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma|^2)] \\ = \sqrt{N-1} \cdot \tan \theta \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^1|^2) + c(\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta, |\widehat{\Phi}_1^\gamma|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.85)$$

One can readily solve them to find that:

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\widehat{S}^\pm} = 2 + \frac{3N+20 \pm \sqrt{N^2+40N+320}}{2(N+8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (5.86)$$

$$\tan \theta = \frac{N+18 + \sqrt{N^2+40N+320}}{2\sqrt{N-1}}. \quad (5.87)$$

These expressions are compatible with perturbative results (5.25).

5.4 Defect operator spectrum for $N = 1$ (Ising DCFT)

In the previous section, we have derived the conformal dimensions of the lowest-lying composite operators within the axiomatic framework. It would be possible to do the same for higher-order

composite operators. However, additional complexity comes in due to the multiplet mixing by the bulk interaction term, which has already happened in our analysis for \widehat{S}^\pm . Nevertheless, we do not have to worry about this affair for $N = 1$. Thus, we here go one step further and study higher-order composite operators \widehat{W}_p ($p = 1, 2, \dots$), tending to $\widehat{\Phi}_p$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_p(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_1|^p(x) \quad (\text{free theory with } N = 1). \quad (5.88)$$

One can deduce one- and two-point functions necessary for our analysis from the results presented in section 5.2.1 by setting $N = 1$. We need three-point correlators involving $\widehat{\Phi}_p$ to access the information about higher-order composite operators. We are particularly interested in the following defect three-point functions:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_1(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_p(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1})}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p}}, \quad (5.89)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_3(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_p(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1})}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^2 |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^4 |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p-2}}, \quad (5.90)$$

which can be computed straightforwardly via Wick's theorem. The defect three-point constants appearing in the above expressions are given by:

$$c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}) = (p+1)!, \quad c(\widehat{\Phi}_3, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}) = 3p(p+1)!. \quad (5.91)$$

The following bulk-defect-defect three-point functions are also important in our analysis:

$$\langle \Phi_1(x) \widehat{\Phi}_p(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1})}{|x - y_2|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p}}, \quad (5.92)$$

$$\langle \Phi_3(x) \widehat{\Phi}_p(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{3\hat{h} c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1})}{|x - y_2|^2 |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p} |x_\perp|^2} + \frac{c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1})}{|x - y_2|^2 |x - y_2|^4 |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p-2}}. \quad (5.93)$$

Following the prescription presented in section 5.3.3, we can derive the following recursive constraint for the conformal dimension of \widehat{W}_p :

$$9 \cdot [\widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_1) + \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_p) - \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_{p+1})] \cdot c(\widehat{\Phi}_1, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}) + c(\widehat{\Phi}_3, \widehat{\Phi}_p, \widehat{\Phi}_{p+1}) = 0, \quad (5.94)$$

where we introduced $\widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_p)$ through the relation:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_p) = p + \widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_p) \cdot \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.95)$$

Provided the initial condition $\widehat{\Gamma}(\widehat{W}_1) = 1$, that follows from (5.60), and the defect three-point coefficients given in (5.91), the constraint (5.94) simplifies to the following expression:

$$\Gamma_{\widehat{W}_{p+1}} = \Gamma_{\widehat{W}_p} + 1 + \frac{p}{3}. \quad (5.96)$$

This recursion relation is solved to give:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_p) = p + \frac{p(p+5)}{6} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.97)$$

We remark that, at the first order in ϵ , we can identify \widehat{W}_2 with \widehat{S}^+ as their conformal dimensions are identical:

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{W}_2) = \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{S}^+) = 2 + \frac{7}{3} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.98)$$

Chapter 6

The $O(N)$ model with Neumann boundary

This chapter is on the $O(N)$ model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions with Neumann boundary.¹ The action of the model is given by the same expression as (4.1) but restricted to the half-spacetime $\mathbb{R}_+^d \equiv \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, on whose boundary Neumann boundary condition is imposed:

$$I = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial\Phi_1|^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} |\Phi_1|^4 \right), \quad \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = 0. \quad (6.1)$$

We here describe results found in existing literature while setting up our notations. Similarly to the case with a line defect, the critical coupling constant and bulk operator spectrum are the same as those without boundaries.² Unlike the line defect case, the Neumann boundary condition preserves the $O(N)$ symmetry. Hence, there is no multiplet mixing on the boundary, and one can readily tackle the higher-order composite operators in this model. We are interested in the conformal dimensions of the boundary local operators that take the following forms in the free theory:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x), \quad (6.2)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_1|^{2p}(x), \quad \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha |\Phi_1|^{2p}(x) \quad p = 1, 2, \dots \quad (6.3)$$

We denote their renormalized operators in conventional perturbative calculations (section 6.2) as well as their Wilson-Fisher counterparts in axiomatic approach (section 6.3) as follows:

$$\widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{y}), \quad \widehat{W}_{2p}(\hat{y}), \quad \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}). \quad (6.4)$$

¹We can regard the Neumann boundary as a co-dimension one (or $(3 - \epsilon)$ -dimensional) defect. Recall that the goal of the perturbative expansion in powers of ϵ is to obtain some theoretical predictions for the $O(N)$ model in three dimensions with the Neumann boundary (two-dimensional defect) eventually by setting $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$.

²See (5.8) for the critical value of bulk coupling constant.

We also denote their conformal dimensions by $\widehat{\Delta}_1$, $\widehat{\Delta}_{2p}$ and $\widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}$, which are, in the standard perturbative framework, computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta}_1 &= \frac{d-2}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_1, & \widehat{\gamma}_1 &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_1}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*}, \\ \widehat{\Delta}_{2p} &= 2p \cdot \frac{d-2}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p}, & \widehat{\gamma}_{2p} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_{2p}}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*}, \\ \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1} &= (2p+1) \cdot \frac{d-2}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1}, & \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_{2p+1}}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*},\end{aligned}\tag{6.5}$$

with \widehat{Z}_1 , Z_{2p} and Z_{2p+1} being wave-function renormalizations defined through the relations:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha = \widehat{Z}_1 \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \quad \widehat{\Phi}_{2p} = \widehat{Z}_{2p} \cdot \widehat{W}_{2p}, \quad \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha = \widehat{Z}_{2p+1} \cdot \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha,\tag{6.6}$$

The conformal dimensions of \widehat{W}_1^α and \widehat{W}_2 have been computed from the standard perturbative calculations (see e.g., [MO93, MO95, RG80]):

$$\widehat{\Delta}_1 = 1 - \frac{N+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2),\tag{6.7}$$

$$\widehat{\Delta}_2 = 2 - \frac{6}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).\tag{6.8}$$

Also, the conformal dimension of \widehat{W}_1^α has already derived from the axiomatic perspective in [DS20, GK20].

We first perform a detailed analysis of the free theory ($\lambda_0 = 0$) in d -dimensions (section 6.1). Using the results, we investigate the boundary operator spectrum in the standard perturbative framework (section 6.2) and the axiomatic framework (section 6.3) to confirm the consistency of these two approaches. Throughout this chapter, for convenience, we redefine the $O(N)$ vector field in the following manner:

$$\Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{new}} = \left(\frac{2(d-2)\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{old}}.\tag{6.9}$$

Notice that this expression tends to $\Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{new}} = 2\pi \cdot \Phi_1^\alpha|_{\text{old}}$ in four dimensions, which is the same as the standard normalization to work in the axiomatic framework (4.26). Under this redefinition (6.9), the two-point function of Φ_1^α behaves as follows:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle \rightarrow \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^{d-2}} + \dots \quad \text{as } x_1 \rightarrow x_2,\tag{6.10}$$

and all equations simplify a great deal.

6.1 Structure of free $O(N)$ model with Neumann boundary

In this section, we work out the free $O(N)$ model with the Neumann boundary condition. In section 6.1.1, we calculate various correlators of the model in d -dimensions. We set the spacetime dimensions to be generic in studying correlation functions because they are necessary for the standard perturbative calculations in section 6.2.³ In section 6.1.2, similarly to the line defect case, we explore BOEs in four dimensions using correlation functions derived in section 6.1.1, setting the stage for the axiomatic approach in section 6.3.

6.1.1 Correlation functions

Under the redefinition of the $O(N)$ vector field (6.9), the differential equation for the Green's function of Φ_1^α reads:

$$\square_{x_1} \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle = \frac{4\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \delta^d(x_1 - x_2). \quad (6.11)$$

This equation can be solved under Neumann boundary condition $\lim_{x_\perp \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = 0$ to give the following two-point function of Φ_1^α :

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^{d-2}} + \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - \bar{x}_2|^{d-2}}, \quad \bar{x}^\mu = (\hat{x}^\mu, -x_\perp). \quad (6.12)$$

One can derive the bulk one-point functions of composite operators such as $\langle \Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta \rangle$ and $\langle |\Phi_1|^2 \rangle$ from (6.12) by taking the coincident limit in (6.12):

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{2^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2}}, \quad \langle |\Phi_1|^2(x) \rangle = \frac{N}{2^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2}}. \quad (6.13)$$

We then take either one or both bulk operators in (6.12) to the boundary to find the two-point functions involving the defect local operator $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$ defined in (6.2):

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{2\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}|^{d-2}}, \quad \langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{2\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{d-2}}. \quad (6.14)$$

In the same way as section 5.2.1, we can derive all other correlators needed for our analysis by utilizing Wick's theorem. First of all, the bulk-defect two-point functions involving Φ_3^α take the following forms:

$$\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{(N/2 + 1)\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{2^{d-4} |x - \hat{y}|^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2}}, \quad \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_3^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{32(N/2 + 1)\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}|^{3(d-2)}}. \quad (6.15)$$

³See figure 4.1 to recall the difference between the standard perturbative approach and the axiomatic approach.

The boundary two-point functions of composite operators turn out to be:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{N g_{p-1}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)}}, \quad (6.16)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)(d-2)}}. \quad (6.17)$$

One can derive these two correlators by taking Wick's contraction once and making recursion relations between them. We have introduced two combinatorial factors f_p and g_p :

$$f_p = 2^{4p+1} p! (N/2 + 1)_p, \quad g_p = 2^{4p+3} (p+1)! (N/2 + 1)_p, \quad (6.18)$$

which also appear in the boundary three-point functions:

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)}}, \quad (6.19)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)(d-2)}}, \quad (6.20)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{12p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^{d-2} |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{2(d-2)} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p-1)(d-2)}}, \quad (6.21)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{2(N + 6p + 2) g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^{d-2} |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{2(d-2)} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)}}. \quad (6.22)$$

It is straightforward to compute boundary three-point functions given the results for two-point functions (6.16) and (6.17). On the other hand, it requires a little care for the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions, as we have to bear in mind the non-vanishing bulk one-point functions (6.13). The results are:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)}}, \quad (6.23)$$

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)(d-2)}}, \quad (6.24)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle \\ &= \frac{N+2}{2^{d-2}} \cdot \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)} |x_\perp|^{d-2}} + \frac{12p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_1|^{d-2} |x - \hat{y}_2|^{2(d-2)} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p-1)(d-2)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle \\ &= \frac{N+2}{2^{d-2}} \cdot \frac{g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^{d-2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)(d-2)} |x_\perp|^{d-2}} + \frac{2(N + 6p + 2) g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_1|^{d-2} |x - \hat{y}_2|^{2(d-2)} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2p(d-2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

6.1.2 Boundary operator expansions in four dimensions

In the same spirit as section 5.2.2, we here make use of the results we have derived so far to write down the BOEs of Φ_1^α and Φ_3^α in four dimensions.

Boundary operator expansion of Φ_1^α . According to the analysis in section 3.6, the only boundary local primaries allowed to be in the BOE of Φ_1^α are $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x)$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |x_\perp|^{-1} \Phi_1^\alpha(x)$ having conformal dimensions one and two respectively. As the latter does not survive under the Neumann boundary condition, the BOE of Φ_1^α takes the form:

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) = \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) . \quad (6.27)$$

Here, we have matched the BOE coefficient from the bulk-defect and defect two-point functions (6.14).

Boundary operator expansion of Φ_3^α . Similarly to the line defect case, there exists an infinite number of defect local operators in the BOE of Φ_3^α :

$$\Phi_3^\alpha(x) = \frac{N+2}{4|x_\perp|^2} \cdot \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} \cdot |x_\perp|^{2n} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants.}) . \quad (6.28)$$

The BOE coefficients $b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)/c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)$ satisfy the following relations:

$$\frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha) c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} = 12 p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{(-1)^n (n+1)!}{(n+3/2)_n} , \quad (6.29)$$

$$\frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha) c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} = 2(N+6p+2) g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{(-1)^n (n+1)!}{(n+3/2)_n} . \quad (6.30)$$

A few comments on this BOE (6.28) are in order. The first term is manifest from the two-point functions involving $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_3^\alpha$ is nothing but $\widehat{\Phi}_3^\alpha$ (see (6.15)). The higher-order operator $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) having odd conformal dimension $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{2n+3}^\alpha) = 2n+3$ is again made up of three $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$'s and $2n$ parallel derivatives $\hat{\partial}^a$. One can confirm these facts by performing the conformal block expansions of bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions (equation (6.25) and (6.26)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(\infty) \rangle \\ &= \frac{N+2}{4} \cdot \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_\perp|^2} + \frac{12 p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^2} \\ &= f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{|x|}{|x_\perp|^3} \cdot \left[\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot G_1^{-1}(v) + 12 p \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (n+1)!}{(n+3/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+3}^{-1}(v) \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$




Figure 6.1: We illustrated the first-order perturbative contributions to the two-point functions of the composite operators \widehat{W}_{2p} , $\widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha$. Black circles (\bullet) represent boundary composite operators, whereas black squares (\blacksquare) stand for the bulk quartic interaction vertex.

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+2}(\infty) \rangle \\
&= \frac{N+2}{4} \cdot \frac{g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_\perp|^2} + \frac{2(N+6p+2) g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x|^2} \\
&= g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{|x|}{|x_\perp|^3} \cdot \left[\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot G_1^{-1}(v) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2(N+6p+2) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (n+1)!}{(n+3/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+3}^{-1}(v) \right], \tag{6.32}
\end{aligned}$$

with the cross ratio $v = |x_\perp|^2/|x|^2$. To reach the last line both in (6.31) and (6.32), we used the hypergeometric identity (A.2) and the explicit forms of conformal blocks in the presence of a boundary ($p = d - 1 = 3 - \epsilon$) given in (3.69), namely:

$$G_1^{-1}(v) = v^{1/2}, \quad G_{2n+3}^{-1}(v) = v^{n+3/2} {}_2F_1(1+n, 2+n; 5/2+2n; v). \tag{6.33}$$

We compare these two conformal block expansions (6.31) and (6.32) with the general expression (3.69) to obtain the relations for BOE coefficients (6.29) and (6.30). Lastly, we would like to emphasize that there are no further contributions to the BOE of Φ_3^α , and the expression (6.28) is exact.

6.2 Standard perturbative approach

We now perform standard perturbative calculations to derive leading anomalous dimensions of boundary local operators $\widehat{\Phi}_{2p}, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha$ ($p = 0, 1, \dots$). In this section, We work in the minimal subtraction scheme up to one-loop level (see figure 6.1).⁴ Before getting into perturbative cal-

⁴For $p = 0$, $\widehat{\Phi}_{2p}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha$ reduces to the identity operator $\mathbf{1}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha$, respectively.

culations, we introduce several notations and lay the groundwork to make the main calculations transparent. Denoting the bare correlators by:

$$I_{2p} = \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \rangle, \quad \delta^{\alpha\beta} I_{2p+1} = \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \rangle, \quad (6.34)$$

we expand them in inverse powers of ϵ together with wave-function renormalizations (see (6.6) for their definitions):

$$I_{2p} = I_{2p,0} + \delta I_{2p}, \quad \delta I_{2p} = \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p}}{\epsilon} + \frac{\delta_2 I_{2p}}{\epsilon^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}\right), \quad (6.35)$$

$$I_{2p+1} = I_{2p+1,0} + \delta I_{2p+1}, \quad \delta I_{2p+1} = \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p+1}}{\epsilon} + \frac{\delta_2 I_{2p+1}}{\epsilon^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}\right), \quad (6.36)$$

and

$$\widehat{Z}_{2p} = 1 + \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p}, \quad \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p} = \frac{\delta_1 \widehat{Z}_{2p}}{\epsilon} + \frac{\delta_2 \widehat{Z}_{2p}}{\epsilon^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}\right), \quad (6.37)$$

$$\widehat{Z}_{2p+1} = 1 + \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p+1}, \quad \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p+1} = \frac{\delta_1 \widehat{Z}_{2p+1}}{\epsilon} + \frac{\delta_2 \widehat{Z}_{2p+1}}{\epsilon^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}\right). \quad (6.38)$$

Here, the two symbols $I_{2p,0}$ and $I_{2p+1,0}$ stand for free theory two-point functions in the presence of a boundary:⁵

$$I_{2p,0} = \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} = \frac{N g_{p-1}}{|\hat{y}|^{2p(d-2)}}, \quad (6.39)$$

$$\delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot I_{2p+1,0} = \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} = \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}|^{(2p+1)(d-2)}}. \quad (6.40)$$

It is worthwhile recording their recursion relations:

$$I_{2p+1,0} = \frac{2(N+2p)}{N} \cdot \frac{I_{2p,0}}{|\hat{y}|^{d-2}}, \quad I_{2p,0} = 4pN \cdot \frac{I_{2p-1,0}}{|\hat{y}|^{d-2}}. \quad (6.41)$$

Under the standard perturbative framework in the minimal subtraction scheme, one can compute the conformal/anomalous dimensions of the operators from their wave-function renormalizations through the relations (6.5). The wave functions renormalizations are to be determined to cancel the divergences of two-point functions of renormalized operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{W}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{W}_{2p}(0) \rangle &= \widehat{Z}_{2p}^{-2} \cdot \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \rangle, \\ \langle \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \rangle &= \widehat{Z}_{2p+1}^{-2} \cdot \langle \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6.42)$$

Plugging (6.35) and (6.37) into (6.42), one finds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{W}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{W}_{2p}(0) \rangle &= I_{2p,0} + \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p} - 2 I_{2p,0} \cdot \delta_1 Z_{2p}}{\epsilon} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right), \\ \langle \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \rangle &= I_{2p+1,0} + \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p+1} - 2 I_{2p+1,0} \cdot \delta_1 Z_{2p+1}}{\epsilon} + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.43)$$

⁵The explicit forms of these two correlators are taken from (6.16) and (6.17).

To cancel the divergences in the right-hand side of the above equations, we have:

$$\delta_1 Z_{2p} = \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p}}{2 I_{2p,0}}, \quad \delta_1 Z_{2p+1} = \frac{\delta_1 I_{2p+1}}{2 I_{2p+1,0}}. \quad (6.44)$$

Let us now tackle perturbative calculations. First of all, as $\widehat{\Phi}_0$ stands for the identity operator $\mathbf{1}$, it receives no perturbative corrections at any orders in perturbation theory if appropriately renormalized:

$$Z_0 = 1, \quad \delta I_0 = 0 \quad (\text{exact}). \quad (6.45)$$

This fact is also clear from the relation between the correlators in free and perturbation theory:

$$\langle \dots \rangle = \frac{\left\langle \dots \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x |\Phi_1|^4\right) \right\rangle_{\text{free}}}{\left\langle \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x |\Phi_1|^4\right) \right\rangle_{\text{free}}}, \quad (6.46)$$

where we redefined the coupling constant correspondingly to the change of the normalization of the $O(N)$ vector field (6.9):

$$\lambda'_0 = \left(\frac{\Gamma(d/2)}{2(d-2)\pi^{d/2}} \right)^2 \cdot \lambda_0 = \frac{\lambda_0}{(4\pi^2)^2} + O(\epsilon). \quad (6.47)$$

Let us focus our attention to the perturbative corrections to δI_{2p} at the first order in λ_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta I_{2p} = & -\frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} \\ & + I_{2p,0} \cdot \frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \rangle_{\text{free}} + O(\lambda_0^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.48)$$

Applying Wick contraction once, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta I_{2p} = & -\frac{\lambda'_0}{3!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle_{\text{free}} \cdot \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p-1}^\beta(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} \\ & + 2p \cdot \langle \widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_1^\beta(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} \cdot \left[-\frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p-1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p-1}^\beta(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} \right] \\ & + I_{2p,0} \cdot \frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \rangle_{\text{free}} + O(\lambda_0^2), \end{aligned} \quad (6.49)$$

After utilizing the free theory results in the last section, one can perform the integrals in the first lines of (6.49) owing to the integration formula (A.11) to give:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{First line of (6.49)}) \\ & = -\frac{g_{p-1} N \lambda'_0}{3! |\hat{y}|^{2p}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \left[\frac{2^{3-d} (N+2) |\hat{y}|^{d-2}}{|x|^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2} |x - \hat{y}|^{d-2}} + \frac{4(N+6p-4) |\hat{y}|^{2(d-2)}}{|x - \hat{y}|^{2(d-2)} |x|^{2(d-2)}} \right] \\ & = -\frac{N+8p-6}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot I_{2p,0} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0), \end{aligned} \quad (6.50)$$

where we have used (6.47), (4.5) and (6.39) to reach the last line. The parenthesis in second line of (6.49) can be associated with $\delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot I_{2p-1,0}$ due to the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \delta I_{2p-1} = & \left[-\frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p-1}^\alpha(\hat{y}) \widehat{\Phi}_{2p-1}^\beta(0) \rangle_{\text{free}} \right] \\ & + \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot I_{2p-1,0} \cdot \frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \rangle_{\text{free}} + O(\lambda_0^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.51)$$

Plugging this into the second line of (6.49), one finds that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Last two lines of (6.49)}) = & \frac{4pN}{|\hat{y}|^{2(d-2)}} \cdot \delta I_{2p-1,0} \\ & + \left(I_{2p,0} - \frac{4pN}{|\hat{y}|^{2(d-2)}} \cdot I_{2p-1,0} \right) \cdot \frac{\lambda'_0}{4!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \langle |\Phi_1|^4(x) \rangle_{\text{free}} + O(\lambda_0^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.52)$$

The second term in (6.52) cancels out due to (6.41), resulting in the following recursion relation:

$$\delta I_{2p} = -\frac{N+8p-6}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \cdot I_{2p,0} + \frac{I_{2p,0}}{I_{2p-1,0}} \cdot \delta I_{2p-1,0} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0). \quad (6.53)$$

With the aid of (6.44), one can rephrase this recursion relation in the language of the wave-function renormalizations:

$$\delta \widehat{Z}_{2p} - \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p-1} = -\frac{N+8p-6}{2\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0). \quad (6.54)$$

Similar analysis for δI_{2p+1} leads to the following recursion relation:

$$\delta \widehat{Z}_{2p+1} - \delta \widehat{Z}_{2p} = -\frac{24p-N-2}{6\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0). \quad (6.55)$$

We can solve these two recursion relations (6.54) and (6.55) under the initial condition (6.45) to find that:

$$\delta \widehat{Z}_{2p} = -\frac{p(N+12p-10)}{3\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2), \quad (6.56)$$

$$\delta \widehat{Z}_{2p+1} = -\frac{(2p-1)N+2(12p^2+2p-1)}{6\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2). \quad (6.57)$$

From these two expressions and the formula (6.5), we obtain the leading anomalous dimensions of $\widehat{\Phi}_{2p}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\alpha$:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\gamma}_{2p} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_r}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = \frac{p(N+12p-10)}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \\ \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_r}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = \frac{(2p-1)N+2(12p^2+2p-1)}{2(N+8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.58)$$

And the conformal dimensions of renormalized operators \widehat{W}_{2p} and $\widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha$ are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} &= 2p \cdot \frac{d-2}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p} = 2p + \frac{6p(2p-3)}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \\ \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1} &= (2p+1) \cdot \frac{d-2}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1} = 2p+1 - \frac{N+6p(1-2p)+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).\end{aligned}\tag{6.59}$$

6.3 Axiomatic approach

We now take the axiomatic approach to study the critical $O(N)$ model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions similarly to the line defect case. We start by deriving the conformal dimension of the lowest-lying boundary local operator $\widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x})$ focusing on the BOE of W_1^α (section 6.3.1) as a warm-up and proceed to the composite operators \widehat{W}_{2p} and $\widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha$ (section 6.3.2).

6.3.1 Lowest-lying boundary local operator

Owing to the boundary conformal symmetry (axiom I'), we have the following BOE of W_1^α :

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \supset D \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}),\tag{6.60}$$

where the coefficient is given by $D = 1 + O(\epsilon)$ as this expression should reduce to (6.27) in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (axiom II'). Employing the equation of motion (4.47) (axiom III') with the help of (3.78), one finds that:

$$\begin{aligned}W_3^\alpha(x) &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \square W_1^\alpha(x) \\ &\supset \frac{D}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1)(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1 + 1)}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1 + 2}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}).\end{aligned}\tag{6.61}$$

Making use of axiom II' and comparing this expression with (6.28) in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the following equation:

$$\frac{N+2}{4} = \frac{(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1)(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1 + 1)}{\kappa} + O(\epsilon).\tag{6.62}$$

Substituting bulk variables κ (4.43) and Δ_1 (4.44) into this equation, one obtains the conformal dimension of the lowest-lying boundary local operator \widehat{W}_1^α :

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta}_1 &= \frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{N+2}{2(N+8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= 1 - \frac{N+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2),\end{aligned}\tag{6.63}$$

in agreement with the known perturbative result (6.7).

6.3.2 Boundary composite operators

We here compute conformal dimensions of boundary composite operators \widehat{W}_{2p} and $\widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\alpha$ by taking the same steps as in section 5.3.3. We start by evaluating the DOE of W_1^α from the equation of motion (4.47) combined with the free theory DOE of Φ_3^α (6.28). Armed with the DOE of W_1^α , we exploit the generic forms of the conformal block expansions (3.69) and some hypergeometric identities to obtain the closed-form expressions of the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions involving W_1^α at order ϵ . Requiring the removal of their unphysical singularities, we derive the conformal dimensions of a class of boundary composite operators.

Boundary operator expansion of W_1^α . It turns out that the BOE of W_1^α takes the form:

$$W_1^\alpha(x) = \frac{D}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1}} \cdot \widehat{W}_1^\alpha(\hat{x}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) / c(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}} \cdot \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants}) . \quad (6.64)$$

Here, the BOE coefficient $D = 1 + O(\epsilon)$ is the same as in (6.60). As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the boundary primary $\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) turns into $\widehat{P}_{2n+3}^\alpha$ with conformal dimension $(2n+3)$ that appears in the BOE of Φ_3^α (6.28), and its BOE coefficient fulfills the condition:

$$\frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} = \frac{\epsilon}{(N+8)(n+1)(2n+1)} \cdot \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{P}_{2n+3}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{P}_{2n+3}^\alpha, \widehat{P}_{2n+3}^\alpha)} + O(\epsilon^2) . \quad (6.65)$$

One way to confirm these relations is to apply the equation of motion (4.47) with the value of κ given in (4.43) to the BOE of W_1^α (6.64):

$$W_3^\alpha(x) \supset \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{\kappa \cdot c(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} \cdot \frac{[\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) + 1]}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) + 2}} \cdot \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha(\hat{x}) \quad (6.66)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)}{\epsilon \cdot c(\widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{P}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} \cdot (N+8)(n+1)(2n+1) \cdot |x_\perp|^{2n} \cdot \widehat{P}_{2n+3}^\alpha(\hat{x}) .$$

Comparing the last line of (6.66) with (6.28), we end up with (6.65).

Study of bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions involving W_1^α . Implementing the general formula for the conformal block expansion (3.69) combined with the BOE (6.64), we can

express the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point function $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{2p} \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta \rangle$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_{2p}(0) \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta(\infty) \rangle &= \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}} \\ &\cdot \left[D \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p}, \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta) \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}(v) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta, \widehat{W}_{2p+2})}{c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}'_{2n+3}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}(v) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.67)$$

with $v = |x_\perp|^2/|x|^2$ being the cross ratio. We now expand the first and the second terms in the parenthesis in the following manner:⁶

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}(v) &= v^{\widehat{\Delta}_1/2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1}}{2}, 1; \frac{1}{2}; v\right) + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= v^{\widehat{\Delta}_1/2} + (\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1}) \epsilon \cdot v^{3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1(1, 1; 3/2; v) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.68)$$

and⁷

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha) c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta, \widehat{W}_{2p+2})}{c(\widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha, \widehat{O}'_{2n+3}{}^\alpha)} G_{\widehat{\Delta}'_{2n+3}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}(v) \\ &= \frac{12p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n n!}{(2n+1)(n+3/2)_n} \cdot v^{n+3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{n+1, n+2}{2n+5/2}; v\right) + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{12p f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot v^{3/2} \cdot {}_2F_1(1, 1; 3/2; v) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.69)$$

We have expanded anomalous dimensions of composite operators in powers of ϵ :

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{2p} = \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} \epsilon + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots, \quad \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1} = \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1} \epsilon + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots, \quad (6.70)$$

and denoted their leading coefficients by $\widehat{\gamma}_{r,1}$. We further notice from (6.19) that:

$$D \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p}, \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta) = c(\widehat{\Phi}_1^\alpha, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p}, \widehat{\Phi}_{2p+1}^\beta) + O(\epsilon) = f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} + O(\epsilon). \quad (6.71)$$

Substituting these expressions into (6.67), we can eventually evaluate the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point correlator $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{2p} \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta \rangle$ up to the first order in ϵ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_{2p}(0) \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta(\infty) \rangle \\ &= D \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p}, \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta) \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_1 + \widehat{\Delta}_{2p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1}}} \\ &\quad + \frac{f_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot [(N+8) \cdot (\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1}) + 12p] \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(1, 1; \frac{3}{2}; \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2}\right) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.72)$$

⁶Use the series expansion of the Gauss's hypergeometric functions (3.66) in going from the first to the second line.

⁷Recall the relations among BOE coefficients (6.65) and (6.29). We obtain the last line of (6.69) by applying the summation formula for Gauss's hypergeometric functions (A.5).

One performs a similar manipulation for the other bulk-boundary-boundary three-point correlator $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta \widehat{W}_{2p+2} \rangle$ to find that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta(0) \widehat{W}_{2p+2}(\infty) \rangle \\ &= D \cdot c(\widehat{W}_1^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{2p}^\beta, \widehat{W}_{2p+2}) \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_1} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_1 + \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+1} - \widehat{\Delta}_{2p+2}}} \\ &+ \frac{g_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot [(N+8)(\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+2,1}) + 2(N+6p+2)] \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(1, 1; \frac{3}{2}; \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2}\right) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.73)$$

Constraint from analyticity. It is clear from the asymptotic behavior of Gauss's hypergeometric functions in the last lines of (6.72) and (6.73):

$${}_2F_1\left(1, 1; \frac{3}{2}; \frac{|x_\perp|^2}{|x|^2}\right) \xrightarrow[\text{with (A.1)}]{|\hat{x}| \sim 0} \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|}{|\hat{x}|} + \dots, \quad (6.74)$$

that the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{2p} \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta \rangle$ and $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{2p+1}^\beta \widehat{W}_{2p+2} \rangle$ are not analytic as $|\hat{x}| \sim 0$. These non-analytic behaviors are similar to the line defect case but more manifest here as the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point correlators involving W_1^α become singular as $|\hat{x}| \rightarrow 0$. They again contradict the analyticity of correlators for non-coincident configurations of points. To resolve this issue, we demand that:

$$(N+8) \cdot (\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1}) + 12p = 0, \quad (6.75)$$

$$(N+8) (\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+2,1}) + 2(N+6p+2) = 0. \quad (6.76)$$

Given the result derived in the previous subsection (6.63) (and also (6.70)), we find that these two constraints result in the following recursion relations with the initial condition $\widehat{\gamma}_{1,1} = -\frac{N+2}{2(N+8)}$:

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1} = \widehat{\gamma}_{2p,1} - \frac{N-24p+2}{2(N+8)}, \quad \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+2,1} = \widehat{\gamma}_{2p+1,1} + \frac{3(N+8p+2)}{2(N+8)}, \quad (6.77)$$

by solving which, we can reproduce the perturbative results (6.58).

Chapter 7

The $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet boundary

This chapter deals with the $O(N)$ model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions with Dirichlet boundary. The action of the model reads:¹

$$I = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \left(\frac{1}{2} |\partial \Phi_1|^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} |\Phi_1|^4 \right), \quad \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = 0. \quad (7.1)$$

The critical $O(N)$ model with the Dirichlet boundary condition describes the so-called ordinary transition of the statistical Ising model. On the other hand, the Neumann boundary condition (chapter 6) corresponds to the special transition. We have another boundary universality class for the bulk Wilson-Fisher fixed point associated with the extraordinary transition. However, we do not deal with that case throughout this thesis since we cannot study it within our axiomatic framework. See footnote 1 in chapter 8 and the paragraph involved for a detailed description.

In what follows, we explore the conformal dimensions of the defect local operators tending to the following ones in the free theory:

$$\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) \equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |x_\perp|^{-1} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} \Phi_1^\alpha(x), \quad (7.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{x}) &\equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |x_\perp|^{-2p} |\Phi_1|^{2p}(x), \\ \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+1}^\alpha(\hat{x}) &\equiv \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} |x_\perp|^{-2p-1} \Phi_1^\alpha |\Phi_1|^{2p}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

for $p = 1, 2, \dots$. Here, the subscripts for free theory operators represent their conformal dimensions in four dimensions. We express their renormalized operators or Wilson-Fisher counterparts as follows:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha(\hat{y}), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}(\hat{y}), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\alpha(\hat{y}). \quad (7.4)$$

¹In this chapter, we consider the model in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions while fixing the co-dimensions of the defect (Dirichlet boundary) to one.

We also denote their conformal dimensions by $\widehat{\Delta}_2, \widehat{\Delta}_{4p}, \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}$, respectively. The conformal dimension of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha$ is derived from standard perturbative calculations (see e.g., [MO93, MO95]) and also from the axiomatic approach (see [DS20, GK20]):

$$\widehat{\Delta}_2 = 2 - \frac{N+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (7.5)$$

We note that the conformal dimension of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha$ is related to the critical exponent for the surface magnetization that can be measured experimentally (see table 1.1 in chapter 1 for a comparison between the theoretical prediction and the experimental data):

$$\widehat{m} \sim |T_c - T|^{\widehat{\beta}}, \quad \widehat{\beta} = \frac{\widehat{\Delta}_2}{d - \Delta_2}, \quad \text{as } T \sim T_c. \quad (7.6)$$

We use the same normalization of the $O(N)$ vector field as the Neumann case (6.9) and take the same path as chapter 6 with attention to the differences in boundary conditions. Section 7.1 reveals the structure of the free $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet boundary. Using the results, we work out the conformal dimensions of the boundary local operators listed in (7.4) both in the standard perturbative approach and the axiomatic approach (section 7.2 and 7.3).

7.1 Structure of free $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet boundary

We now investigate the free $O(N)$ model in d -dimensions with Neumann boundary condition. After computing correlation functions in d -dimensions (section 7.1.1), we specify spacetime dimensions to four and spell out the BOEs of two bulk primaries Φ_1^α and Φ_3^α , that are closely tied to the multiplet recombination phenomena at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point and play the central roles in our axiomatic analysis (section 7.3). We will use the expressions of correlation functions in d -dimensions in the standard perturbative calculations (section 7.2). On the other hand, we will need the free theory BOEs in four dimensions in the axiomatic approach (section 7.3).

7.1.1 Correlation functions

Under Dirichlet boundary condition $\lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = 0$, the differential equation for the two-point function of Φ_1^α (6.11) is solved by:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x_1) \Phi_1^\beta(x_2) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - x_2|^{d-2}} - \frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_1 - \bar{x}_2|^{d-2}}, \quad \bar{x}^\mu = (\hat{x}^a, -x_\perp). \quad (7.7)$$

Similarly to the Neumann case, we take the coincident limit of the above expression to find bulk one-point functions of composite operators $\Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta$ and $|\Phi_1|^2$:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha \Phi_1^\beta(x) \rangle = -\frac{\delta^{\alpha\beta}}{2^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2}}, \quad \langle |\Phi_1|^2(x) \rangle = -\frac{N}{2^{d-2} |x_\perp|^{d-2}}, \quad (7.8)$$

Performing the same manipulation as the equation (6.14), one obtains the two-point functions involving the lowest-lying boundary local operator $\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha$ (7.2):

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_2^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle = \frac{2(d-2) \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp}{|x - \hat{y}|^d}, \quad \langle \widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_2^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{2(d-2) \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^d}. \quad (7.9)$$

Wick's theorem allows us to calculate all the other correlators of our interest. The bulk-boundary two-point functions concerning Φ_3^α turn out to take the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_2^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle &= -\frac{(d-2)(N/2+1) \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{2^{d-4} |x - \hat{y}|^d |x_\perp|^{d-3}}, \\ \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_6^\beta(\hat{y}) \rangle &= \frac{32(d-2)^3 (N/2+1) \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp^3}{|x - \hat{y}|^{3d}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

It follows from the principle of mathematical induction combined with Wick's contraction that the boundary two-point functions of composite operators (7.3) have the following expressions:

$$\langle \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{N b_{p-1}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd}}, \quad \langle \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)d}}. \quad (7.11)$$

The two symbols a_p and b_p are defined by:

$$a_p \equiv 2^{6p+2} p! (N/2+1)_p, \quad b_p \equiv 2^{6p+5} (p+1)! (N/2+1)_p. \quad (7.12)$$

They are also related to the boundary three-point coefficients in the following manner:

$$\langle \widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd}}, \quad (7.13)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)d}}, \quad (7.14)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Psi}_6^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{4(N+6p+2) b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^d |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{2d} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd}}, \quad (7.15)$$

$$\langle \widehat{\Psi}_6^\alpha(\hat{x}) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{24p a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^d |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^{2d} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p-1)d}}. \quad (7.16)$$

We further record the following bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions that will be used in section 7.1.2 to uncover the BOE structures of Φ_1^α and Φ_3^α in four dimensions:

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{d-2}{2} \cdot \frac{a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd}}, \quad (7.17)$$

$$\langle \Phi_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle = \frac{d-2}{2} \cdot \frac{b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)d}}, \quad (7.18)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_2) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{N+2}{2^{d-2}} \cdot \frac{(d/2-1) \cdot a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x - \hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd} x_\perp^{d-3}} + \frac{(d/2-1)^3 \cdot 24p a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp^3}{|x - \hat{y}_1|^d |x - \hat{y}_2|^{2d} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p-1)d}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{N+2}{2^{d-2}} \cdot \frac{(d/2-1) \cdot b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x-\hat{y}_2|^d |\hat{y}_{12}|^{(2p+1)d} x_\perp^{d-3}} + \frac{(d/2-1)^3 \cdot 4(N+6p+2) b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} x_\perp^3}{|x-\hat{y}_1|^d |x-\hat{y}_2|^{2d} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{2pd}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

One way to compute these four bulk-boundary-boundary three-point correlators is to isolate bulk operators by applying Wick's contractions and to exploit the results for the boundary two-point functions (7.11). Notice that all these correlators we have enumerated so far are in line with the generic forms of the BCFT correlators (see section 3.4) and thus are compatible with boundary conformal symmetry.

7.1.2 Boundary operator expansions in four dimensions

Let us investigate the BOEs of Φ_1^α and Φ_3^α in four dimensions from the results presented in the last subsection. We extract BOE coefficients by comparing the correlation functions with the generic forms of BCFT correlators (section 3.4). For the BOE of Φ_3^α , we also implement the conformal block expansions of the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions involving Φ_3^α to see its BOE content inaccessible from lower-point functions.

Boundary operator expansion of Φ_1^α . According to section 3.6, the Klein-Gordon equation requires that the boundary local operators that contribute to the BOE of Φ_1^α have conformal dimension one or two, and all other operators are prohibited. Unlike the Neumann case, the only boundary local operator that shows up in the BOE of Φ_1^α is $\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x})$ (see (7.2) for its definition) having conformal dimension two:

$$\Phi_1^\alpha(x) = x_\perp \cdot \widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants}). \quad (7.21)$$

Boundary operator expansion of Φ_3^α . The BOE of Φ_3^α takes the form:

$$\Phi_3^\alpha(x) = -\frac{N+2}{4|x_\perp|} \cdot \widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)} x_\perp^{2n+3} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha(\hat{x}) + (\text{descendants}). \quad (7.22)$$

We find a series of composite operators $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha$ with $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha) = 2n+6$ involving three $\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha$'s and $2n$ parallel derivatives $\hat{\partial}^a$. We notice that their BOE coefficients satisfy the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha) c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}^\alpha, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)} = 24p a_p \cdot \frac{(-1)^n (2)_n (4)_n}{(n+9/2)_n n!} \delta^{\alpha\beta}, \\ & \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha) c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)} = 4(N+6p+2) b_p \cdot \frac{(-1)^n (2)_n (4)_n}{(n+9/2)_n n!} \delta^{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

One can confirm this BOE (7.22) immediately from the following conformal block expansions of the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions (7.19) and (7.20):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}(0) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(\infty) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot \frac{a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_\perp|} + \frac{24p a_p |x_\perp|^3}{|x|^4} \\
&= a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{|x|^2}{x_\perp^3} \cdot \left[-\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot G_2^{-2}(v) + 24p \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (n+1) (4)_n}{(n+9/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+6}^{-2}(v) \right], \tag{7.24}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Phi_3^\alpha(x) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta(0) \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+4}(\infty) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot \frac{b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{|x_\perp|} + 4(N+6p+2) \cdot \frac{b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} |x_\perp|^3}{|x|^4} \\
&= b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \frac{|x|^2}{x_\perp^3} \cdot \left[-\frac{N+2}{4} \cdot G_2^{-2}(v) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 4(N+6p+2) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (n+1) (4)_n}{(n+9/2)_n} \cdot G_{2n+6}^{-2}(v) \right], \tag{7.25}
\end{aligned}$$

with $v = |x_\perp|^2/|x|^2$ being the cross ratio. In deriving these conformal block expansions, we employed the hypergeometric identity (A.2) and the explicit form of the conformal block (3.69). More specifically, we used:

$$G_2^{-2}(v) = v^2, \quad G_{2n+6}^{-2}(v) = v^{n+3} \cdot {}_2F_1(n+2, n+4; 2n+11/2; v). \tag{7.26}$$

One can read off the BOE relations (7.23) by comparing (7.24) and (7.25) with (3.69).

7.2 Standard perturbative approach

In the section, we derive anomalous dimensions of $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha$ ($p = 0, 1, \dots$) from standard perturbative calculations. Since the calculations are straightforward and almost identical to the Neumann case (section 6.2), we omit the details and only leave the rough sketch of the derivations.

We first introduce wave-function renormalizations of the boundary local operators of our interest through the relations:

$$\widehat{\Psi}_{4p} = \widehat{Z}_{4p} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}, \quad \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha = \widehat{Z}_{4p+2} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\alpha. \tag{7.27}$$

which are to be determined to cancel the divergence of $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p} \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p} \rangle$ and $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta \rangle$. By calculating these two-point functions up to the one-loop level in a similar manner to the Neumann

case, one arrives at the recursion relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\widehat{Z}_{4p} - \delta\widehat{Z}_{4p-2} &= -\frac{N+12p-10}{6\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0), \\ \delta\widehat{Z}_{4p+2} - \delta\widehat{Z}_{4p} &= -\frac{12p-N-2}{6\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2, \epsilon^0),\end{aligned}\tag{7.28}$$

where $\widehat{Z}_{4p} = 1 + \delta\widehat{Z}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{Z}_{4p+2} = 1 + \delta\widehat{Z}_{4p+2}$. These recursion relations are solved under initial condition $\delta\widehat{Z}_0 = 0$, which follows from the fact that there are no quantum corrections to the identity operator $\widehat{\Psi}_0 = 1$ to give the following expressions:

$$Z_{4p} = 1 - \frac{2p(p-1)}{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2),\tag{7.29}$$

$$Z_{4p+2} = 1 - \frac{12p^2 - N - 2}{6\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} + O(\lambda^2).\tag{7.30}$$

Then, one can calculate the anomalous dimensions of $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha$:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\gamma}_{4p} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_{4p}}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = \frac{6p(p-1)}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \\ \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2} &= \left. \frac{\partial \log \widehat{Z}_{4p+2}}{\partial \log \mu} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} = \frac{12p^2 - N - 2}{2(N+8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).\end{aligned}\tag{7.31}$$

Because the canonical dimensions of $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha$ are given by $4p \cdot d/2$ and $(4p+2) \cdot d/2$ respectively, the conformal dimension of the renormalized operators turn out to be:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta}_{4p} &= 4p \cdot \frac{d}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p} = 4p - \frac{p(N-6p+14)}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \\ \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2} &= (4p+2) \cdot \frac{d}{2} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2} = 4p+2 - \frac{N-6p^2+p(N+8)+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).\end{aligned}\tag{7.32}$$

We remark that the conformal dimension of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}$ is the same as spacetime dimensions $\widehat{\Delta}_4 = 4 - \epsilon = d$, making it possible to identify $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}$ with the displacement operator \widehat{D} (see section 3.2 for details) up to the first order in ϵ .² It may be interesting to check whether its higher-order anomalous dimensions vanish as expected.

²This statement is true in free theory in d dimensions as below. The (improved) stress tensor of the free $O(N)$ -model is given by (see e.g., [AE15, equation (1.34)]):

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) \propto \partial_\mu \Phi_1^\alpha \partial_\nu \Phi_1^\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mu\nu} |\partial \Phi_1|^2 - \frac{d-2}{4(d-1)} (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu - \delta_{\mu\nu} \square) |\Phi_1|^2 \quad (\text{free}),\tag{7.33}$$

and the displacement operator in BCFT is related to the transverse component of the stress tensor by the relation (3.10). Hence, under Dirichlet boundary condition $\lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^\alpha(x) = 0$, we have:

$$\widehat{D}(\hat{x}) = \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} T_{\perp\perp}(x) \propto \partial_\perp \Phi_1^\alpha \partial_\perp \Phi_1^\alpha = \widehat{\Psi}_4.\tag{7.34}$$

7.3 Axiomatic approach

Finally, we apply the axiomatic framework to the $O(N)$ model with a Dirichlet boundary. It is straightforward to derive the conformal dimensions of the lowest-lying boundary local operator (section 7.3.1). Similarly to the previous two chapters, we derive conformal dimensions of composite operators by requiring the analyticity of correlators away from the coincidence of points at order ϵ .

7.3.1 Lowest-lying boundary local operator

Thanks to axiom **I'**, the theory is described by BCFT and the BOE of W_1^α takes the form:

$$W_1^\alpha(x) \supset D' \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}). \quad (7.35)$$

Here, we have $D' = 1 + O(\epsilon)$ from axiom **II'** combined with (7.21). We then apply the equation of motion (4.47) (axiom **II'**) to have:

$$\begin{aligned} W_3^\alpha(x) &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \square W_1^\alpha(x) \\ &\supset \frac{D'}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2)(\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2 + 1)}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2 + 2}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha(\hat{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.36)$$

For this BOE to match (7.22) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (axiom **II'**), we obtain the equation that determines $\widehat{\Delta}_2$:

$$-\frac{N+2}{4} \kappa = (\widehat{\Delta}_2 - \Delta_1)(\widehat{\Delta}_2 - \Delta_1 - 1) + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (7.37)$$

Provided that the conformal dimension of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha$ should be $\widehat{\Delta}_2 = 2 + O(\epsilon)$, this equation is solved by:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}_2 &= \frac{d}{2} - \frac{N+2}{2(N+8)} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \\ &= 2 - \frac{N+5}{N+8} \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (7.38)$$

reproducing the perturbative result (7.5).

7.3.2 Boundary composite operators

We now focus on the boundary composite operators $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\alpha$, tending to $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\alpha$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see (7.3) for the definitions for free theory operators). Our ultimate goal is to find the closed-form expressions of the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions such as $\langle W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta \rangle$ and $\langle W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+4} \rangle$, and remove their unphysical singularity to obtain the constraints for

anomalous dimensions of the operators involved at order ϵ . To this end, we derive the BOE of W_1^α , plug it into the generic form of the conformal block expansions of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions given in (3.69), and apply some resummation techniques to get closed-form expressions.

Boundary operator expansion of W_1^α . The final expression for the BOE of W_1^α is:

$$W_1^\alpha(x) = \frac{D'}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha(\widehat{x}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}(\widehat{x}) + (\text{descendants}), \quad (7.39)$$

where $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6} = \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha$ (the same boundary composite operator that appeared in section 7.1.2) with $\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha) = 2n + 6 + O(\epsilon)$. We further note an identity for BOE coefficients:

$$\frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})} = \frac{\epsilon}{(N+8)(n+2)(2n+5)} \cdot \frac{b(\Phi_3^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha)} + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (7.40)$$

Given the value of κ (4.43), one can check these relations by comparing (7.22) with the following BOE in taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit (axiom II'):

$$\begin{aligned} W_3^\alpha(x) &\stackrel{(4.47)}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \square W_1^\alpha(x) \\ &\stackrel{(7.39)}{\supset} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}{\kappa \cdot c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})} \cdot \frac{[\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})] \cdot [\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}) + 1]}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}) + 2}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}(\widehat{x}) \\ &\xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}{\epsilon \cdot c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})} \cdot (N+8)(n+2)(2n+5) \cdot x_\perp^{2n+3} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{2n+6}^\alpha(\widehat{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.41)$$

Study of bulk-boundary-boundary three-point functions involving W_1^α . With the BOE of W_1^α (7.39) and the expression for the conformal block expansions (3.69), the bulk-boundary-boundary three-point function $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p} \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta \rangle$ becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}(0) \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta(\infty) \rangle &= \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_{4p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}} \\ &\cdot \left[D' \cdot c(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta) \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{4p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}(v) \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}) c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta)}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6}, \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}'_{2n+6})}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{4p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}(v) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.42)$$

In what follows, we expand (7.42) at the first order in ϵ to obtain the closed-form expression. For the first term in the parenthesis of (7.42), we have:

$$D' \cdot c(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p}, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta) = c(\widehat{\Psi}_2^\alpha, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p}, \widehat{\Psi}_{4p+2}^\beta) + O(\epsilon) = a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta} + O(\epsilon), \quad (7.43)$$

and

$$G_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{4p}-\widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}(v) = v^{\widehat{\Delta}_2/2} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1}}{2}, 2; 3/2; v\right) + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (7.44)$$

$$\stackrel{(3.66)}{=} v^{\widehat{\Delta}_2/2} + \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1}}{3} \epsilon \cdot v^2 \cdot h(v) + O(\epsilon^2).$$

We have expanded the anomalous dimensions as follows:

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{4p} = \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,1} \epsilon + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots, \quad \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2} = \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1} \epsilon + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,2} \epsilon^2 + \dots \quad (7.45)$$

We also denoted by $h(v)$ the following sum of two Gauss's hypergeometric functions:

$$h(v) = {}_2F_1(1, 2; 5/2; v) + {}_2F_1(1, 1; 5/2; v) \stackrel{(3.66)}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1)_n (n+2)}{(5/2)_n} \cdot v^n. \quad (7.46)$$

Exploiting two relations for BOE coefficients (7.23) and (7.40) as well as the hypergeometric identity.³

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (n+1) (4)_n}{(n+2)(2n+5)(n+9/2)_n} \cdot v^{n+1} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{n+2, n+4}{2n+11/2}; v\right) = \frac{h(v) - 2}{12}, \quad (7.47)$$

one can verify that the second term of the parenthesis of (7.42) reduces to the following expression:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{b(W_1^\alpha, \widehat{Q}'_{2n+6}^\alpha) c(\widehat{Q}'_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{4p}, \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta)}{c(\widehat{Q}'_{2n+6}^\alpha, \widehat{Q}'_{2n+6}^\alpha)} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}(\widehat{Q}'_{2n+6}^\alpha)}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{4p}-\widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}(v) \quad (7.48)$$

$$= \frac{2p a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot v^2 \cdot [h(v) - 2] + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Putting these all together, we end up with:

$$\langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_{4p}(0) \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta(\infty) \rangle$$

$$= D' \cdot c(\widehat{W}_2^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{4p}, \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta) \cdot \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_2 + \widehat{\Delta}_{4p} - \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2}}} - \frac{4p a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{N+8} \epsilon \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^3}{|x|^2} \quad (7.49)$$

$$+ \frac{a_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{3(N+8)} \epsilon \cdot [(N+8)(\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1}) + 6p] \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^3}{|x|^2} \cdot h(v) + O(\epsilon^2).$$

It is straightforward to do a similarly analysis for $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta \widehat{W}_{4p+4} \rangle$. The final result is:

$$\langle W_1^\alpha(x) \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta(0) \widehat{W}_{4p+4}(\infty) \rangle$$

$$= D' \cdot c(\widehat{W}_2^\alpha, \widehat{W}_{4p+2}^\beta, \widehat{W}_{4p+4}) \cdot \frac{1}{x_\perp^{\Delta_1 - \widehat{\Delta}_2} |x|^{\widehat{\Delta}_2 + \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+2} - \widehat{\Delta}_{4p+4}}} \quad (7.50)$$

$$+ \frac{b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{3(N+8)} \epsilon \cdot [(N+8)(\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+4,1}) + (N+6p+2)]$$

$$\cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^3}{|x|^2} \cdot h(v) - \frac{2(N+6p+2) b_p \delta^{\alpha\beta}}{3(N+8)} \epsilon \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|^3}{|x|^2} + O(\epsilon^2).$$

³This can be shown by expanding in powers of v order by order.

Constraint from analyticity. The two correlation functions we have derived so far $\langle W_1^\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p} \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta \rangle$ (7.49) and $\langle W_1^\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+2}^\beta \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{4p+4} \rangle$ (7.50) exhibit unphysical singularities due to the asymptotic form of $h(v)$ introduced in (7.46):

$$h(v) \xrightarrow[\text{with (A.1)}]{|\hat{x}| \sim 0} \frac{3\pi}{4} \cdot \frac{|x_\perp|}{|\hat{x}|} + \dots . \quad (7.51)$$

All Euclidean correlators should be analytic away from the coincidence of points owing to the Euclidean QFT axioms [OS73, OS75]. All operators in (7.49) and (7.50) are still distant from each other when $|\hat{x}| = 0$, but we have singularities, resulting in a contradiction. To remove these unphysical singularities associated with the limiting behaviors as $|\hat{x}| \rightarrow 0$, we require that:

$$(N + 8) (\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1}) + 6p = 0 , \quad (7.52)$$

$$(N + 8) (\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} + \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+2,1} - \widehat{\gamma}_{4p+4,1}) + (N + 6p + 2) = 0 . \quad (7.53)$$

Using (7.38) as the initial condition $\widehat{\gamma}_{2,1} = -\frac{N+2}{2(N+8)}$, one can solve these two recursion relations (7.52) and (7.53) to give the same results as in the standard perturbative approach (7.31).

Chapter 8

Conclusion

In this thesis, we first described the uses of conformal symmetry in QFTs with and without defects (chapter 2 and 3). In chapter 4, we introduced the axiomatic framework to explore the critical phenomena while comparing it with the standard perturbative approach. We then studied the critical $O(N)$ model near four dimensions in the presence of three types of defects: line defect, Neumann and Dirichlet boundary (chapter 5, 6 and 7). In particular, based on the axiomatic framework, we analyzed the model leveraging DCFT techniques to confirm agreement with the standard perturbative calculations. Below, we summarize the main result of the thesis and then give an outlook for the future.

For the model with a line defect (chapter 5), we have shown that the critical defect coupling can be fixed uniquely from our axioms. Though the equation of motion only specifies the relation among bulk operators, one can exploit DOEs to propagate that constraint onto the defect coupling, reproducing the same result as the perturbative calculations [CKM21]. It is effortless to derive the conformal dimensions of the non-composite operators in the axiomatic approach because they appear in the DOE of the free $O(N)$ vector field Φ_1^α . However, this strategy does not apply to composite operators absent in the DOE of Φ_1^α . Nevertheless, we pointed out that it is still possible to determine conformal dimensions of composite operators within the axiomatic framework by requiring the resolution of unphysical non-analyticities of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions, giving consistent results with the known research.

We did a similar analysis for the case with Neumann and Dirichlet boundaries in chapter 6 and 7. As we could not find the conformal dimensions of the higher boundary composite operators in existing literature, we also performed standard perturbative calculations in both cases. The perfect matching between the results of the two different approaches at the leading order in ϵ confirms the overall utility of the axioms, including the defect conformal symmetry and the bulk equation of motion (4.47) in $(4 - \epsilon)$ dimensions.

Relevant defect local operators having conformal dimensions smaller than the dimension of

the defect have dynamical information about the defect since their conformal dimensions are related to defect critical exponents and are also to the stability of critical points under the defect RG flow in the theory space of coupling constants [KNSW18]. The higher-order defect composite operators we derived in this thesis may seem unimportant as they are irrelevant defect local operators insensitive to defect critical exponents and the defect RG flow. Nevertheless, one may use them as input data for solving crossing equations to refine the conformal bootstrap approach in the presence of a defect. We hope our findings contribute to more precise predictions of critical exponents and a more conceptual understanding of extended objects in our world.

Roughly speaking, one of the advantages of the axiomatic approach over the conventional perturbative framework combined with RG analysis is that one can reduce the calculations to combinatorial problems. We only need some DCFT techniques and free DCFT data that are tractable via Wick's theorem without resorting to the standard diagrammatic calculations, which get more painstaking when the defect breaks translational invariance. We are sure that our approach is much simpler than the standard perturbative calculations in studying defect local non-composite operators and critical defect coupling constants. For defect local composite operators, it depends on personal preference whether to choose our approach or the conventional perturbative approach. Nevertheless, the axiomatic approach should still serve as a nice consistency check. It is worthwhile noting that our analysis has extended the potential applications of the analyticity of correlators, though it is a rather technical development. No one has succeeded in extending Rychkov-Tan's axiomatic framework to higher orders in ϵ , even for the cases without defects. Despite this disadvantage, our axiomatic framework is still quite a shortcut to studying critical phenomena and has the potential application to various models with defects.

Unlike the line defect made by smearing the first component of the $O(N)$ vector along one spacetime direction, we imposed Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions uniformly for the $O(N)$ vector field in this thesis, and the models end up with no internal symmetry breaking on the boundary. Let us consider the case in which we impose the Neumann boundary condition for the first m components of the $O(N)$ vector field $\Phi_1^{\alpha'}$ ($\alpha' = 1, \dots, m$) and Dirichlet boundary condition for the rest $\Phi_1^{\alpha''}$ ($\alpha'' = m + 1, \dots, N$):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} \Phi_1^{\alpha'}(x) &= 0 & \text{for } \alpha' = 1, \dots, m, \\ \lim_{|x_\perp| \rightarrow 0} \Phi_1^{\alpha''}(x) &= 0 & \text{for } \alpha'' = m + 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (8.1)$$

This mixed boundary condition causes the following internal symmetry breaking on the boundary:

$$O(N) \rightarrow O(m) \times O(N - m). \quad (8.2)$$

In such a case, one can identify the tilt operators associated with this symmetry breaking with the transverse component of the broken currents, according to the argument in section 3.2. Recall that the conserved current of the $O(N)$ global symmetry is given by $J_\mu^{\alpha\beta} = \Phi_1^\alpha \partial_\mu \Phi_1^\beta - \Phi_1^\beta \partial_\mu \Phi_1^\alpha$

for $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, N$ in free theory. Then, the tilt operators should be expressed by $\hat{t}^{\alpha'\alpha''} = \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\alpha'} \partial_\perp \widehat{\Phi}_1^{\alpha''}$ when no interactions are present. Even with interactions, the conformal dimensions of the tilt operators should always be $(d - 1)$ from the anomalous conservation law (3.11) and receive no quantum corrections as the stress tensor and the displacement operator. It will be interesting to do the standard perturbative calculations or apply the axiomatic framework for the model to check this speculation.

As a byproduct of our analysis, we invented a systematic way to uncover the structure of free DCFTs. We studied various correlation functions of free DCFTs via Wick's theorem and extracted several DOE spectra. In particular, we demonstrated that, unlike Klein-Gordon fields, the DOE contents of generic operators are complicated but still accessible by looking at the conformal block expansion of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions. We expect this methodology and knowledge will be instructive for future readers eager to know more about the generic structures of DCFTs. We did not focus on other correlators that depend on cross ratios, such as bulk two-point functions, bulk-bulk-defect three-point functions, and defect four-point functions. It will be interesting to apply our results to the analysis of these correlators for further extraction of the free DCFT data.

One can employ our axiomatic approach to critical phenomena with defects if and only if there exist corresponding free DCFTs. Hence, our axiomatic framework does not apply to the extraordinary transition that is also supposed to be described by BCFT, as it fails to have corresponding free theories in four dimensions.¹ Likewise, one cannot apply our axiomatic framework directly to the recently proposed surface defect in the critical $O(N)$ model [Tre23, GL23]. Nevertheless, even in such cases, the concept of the equation of motion due to the multiplet recombination is still available [LRvR12, appendix B.4], and one can combine the equation of motion with conformal bootstrap techniques to study DCFT as demonstrated in [HS22b], instead of conventional perturbative approach. It will be interesting to pursue this direction further with the analytical constraints from correlation functions in mind.

¹There are three kinds of boundary critical phenomena depending on whether boundary or bulk orders first: ordinary, special, and extraordinary transition. The critical $O(N)$ model with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary, which we studied in the main text, describes the first two cases. On the other hand, the extraordinary transition breaks the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry $\Phi_1^\alpha \leftrightarrow -\Phi_1^\alpha$, and the bulk one-point function of the $O(N)$ vector field acquires non-zero expectation value. As argued in section 3.6, this contradicts the Klein-Gordon equation in four dimensions. Therefore, we have no free BCFTs in four-dimensional spacetime corresponding to the extraordinary transition.

Acknowledgment

Firstly, I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Tatsuma Nishioka. He was an assistant professor when I joined the theoretical particle physics group at Tokyo University. He won rapid promotion and became an associate professor at Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics when I was about to get a master's degree and got a position as a professor at Osaka University a year later. It was a precious experience for me, as a young graduate student, to get involved in three different environments. I could learn a lot in his company and through collaboration with him, such as proper deportment and what it means to work as a professional scientist in academia. My scientific interest had gradually deviated from what it was when I entered graduate school. Besides, I am the kind of person who does not listen to others and rarely goes to the office. So, I suppose it was not easy for him to handle me. It is his patience and kindness that have made it possible to complete this dissertation.

Going through three different research groups: Tokyo University, Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, and Osaka University, I got acquainted with many people there. I would also like to express my gratitude to all of them. In particular, I would like to thank my collaborators Nozomu Kobayashi, Kento Watanabe, Kohki Kawabata, Soichiro Shimamori, and Tatsuma Nishioka. I am also grateful to my formal supervisor Yutaka Matsuo, for his continuous support and encouragement, though I was distant from him except for the first year in graduate school.

I also thank all financial support and grants both from our government and a private company: Forefront Physics and Mathematics Program to Drive Transformation (FoPM), a World-leading Innovative Graduate Study (WINGS) Program, the University of Tokyo, JSPS fellowship for young students, MEXT, and JSR fellowship, the University of Tokyo. All these add up to the foundations of my learning and inspired me to become more innovative in my search for knowledge throughout my Ph.D. journey.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family, friends, and all the others involved who have decorated my private life. It is too hard to name just a few, and I would be rude if I put them in order or emphasize a particular person. What I owe them is beyond evaluation.

Appendix A

Useful identities

We here list several identities used in the main text.

Kummer's connection formula for Gauss's hypergeometric function.

$$\begin{aligned} {}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) &= \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma - \alpha - \beta)}{\Gamma(\gamma - \alpha)\Gamma(\gamma - \beta)} \cdot {}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \alpha + \beta - \gamma + 1; 1 - z) \\ &+ \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha + \beta - \gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} \cdot (1 - z)^{\gamma - \alpha - \beta} \cdot {}_2F_1(\gamma - \alpha, \gamma - \beta; \gamma - \alpha - \beta + 1; 1 - z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Decomposition of unity in terms of Gauss's hypergeometric functions.

$$1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\alpha)_n (\beta)_n}{(n + \lambda)_n n!} \cdot z^n \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\alpha + n, \beta + n; \lambda + 1 + 2n; z\right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This follows immediately from [Luk69, equation (9.1.32)] by setting $t = 2, u = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\gamma_1)_n \cdots (\gamma_t)_n}{(\sigma_1)_n \cdots (\sigma_u)_n (n + \lambda)_n n!} \\ &\cdot z^n \cdot {}_tF_{u+1}\left(\gamma_1 + n, \cdots, \gamma_t + n; \lambda + 1 + 2n, \sigma_1 + n, \cdots, \sigma_u + n; z\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $z \in \mathbb{C}$ for $1 \leq t < u + 1$ and $z \neq 1, |\arg(1 - z)| < \pi$ for $1 \leq t = u + 2$. Here, ${}_pF_q$ is a generalized hypergeometric function defined by the power series:¹

$${}_pF_q\left(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_p; \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_q; z\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha_1)_n \cdots (\alpha_p)_n}{(\beta_1)_n \cdots (\beta_q)_n n!} \cdot z^n. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

¹The series expansion of the generalized hypergeometric function ${}_pF_q$ converges in the entire complex z -plane for $p \leq q$. When $q = p + 1$, this is convergent as a power series only for $|z| < 1$, but is analytically continued for $|\arg(1 - z)| < \pi$. The convergence on the unit circle $|z| = 1$ is conditional depending on $\chi_p \equiv \text{Re}[(\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{p+1}) - (\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_p)]$: absolutely convergent for $\chi_p > 0$, convergent except at $z = 1$ for $-1 < \chi_p \leq 0$ and divergent for $\chi_p \leq -1$.

Decomposition of Gauss's hypergeometric function in terms of Gauss's hypergeometric functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\alpha)_n (\lambda - \gamma + 1)_n (\gamma - \beta)_n}{(\gamma)_n (n + \lambda)_n n!} \cdot z^n \\
&\quad \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha + n, \beta + \lambda - \gamma + 1 + n \\ \lambda + 1 + 2n \end{matrix}; z\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

We start with equation (9.1.13) in [Luk69]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}_{p+r}F_{q+s}\left(\begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p, c_1, \dots, c_r \\ b_1, \dots, b_q, d_1, \dots, d_s \end{matrix}; z\omega\right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\alpha_1)_n \cdots (\alpha_t)_n (a_1)_n \cdots (a_p)_n}{(\beta_1)_n \cdots (\beta_u)_n (b_1)_n \cdots (b_q)_n (n + \lambda)_n n!} \cdot z^n \\
&\quad \cdot {}_{p+t}F_{q+u+1}\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha_1 + n, \dots, \alpha_t + n, a_1 + n, \dots, a_p + n \\ \lambda + 1 + 2n, \beta_1 + n, \dots, \beta_u + n, b_1 + n, \dots, b_q + n \end{matrix}; z\right) \\
&\quad \cdot {}_{r+u+2}F_{s+t}\left(\begin{matrix} -n, n + \lambda, c_1, \dots, c_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_u \\ \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t, d_1, \dots, d_s \end{matrix}; \omega\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

By setting $p = t = r = s = 1, q = u = 0$ and $\omega = 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\alpha)_n (\rho)_n}{(n + \lambda)_n n!} \cdot {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} -n, n + \lambda, \beta \\ \rho, \gamma \end{matrix}; 1\right) \\
&\quad \cdot z^n \cdot {}_2F_1(\alpha + n, \rho + n; \lambda + 1 + 2n; z).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

When $\rho = \lambda + \beta - \gamma + 1$, we can make use of Saalschütz's theorem [Bai35, page 9]

$${}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a, b, -n \\ c, 1 + a + b - c - n \end{matrix}; 1\right) = \frac{(c - a)_n (c - b)_n}{(c)_n (c - a - b)_n}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \tag{A.8}$$

to simplify ${}_3F_2$ as follows:

$${}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} -n, n + \lambda, \beta \\ \lambda + \beta - \gamma + 1, \gamma \end{matrix}; 1\right) = \frac{(\lambda - \gamma + 1)_n (\gamma - \beta)_n}{(\lambda + \beta - \gamma + 1)_n (\gamma)_n}. \tag{A.9}$$

Employing the relation $(z - n)_n = (-1)^n (1 - z)_n$ that follows immediately from Euler's reflection formula $\Gamma(z)\Gamma(1 - z) = \pi / \sin \pi z$, we conclude (A.5).

An alternative way to show (A.5) is to set $p = q = u = 0, s = 1, r = t = 2, \omega = 1$ in (A.6):

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (\sigma)_n (\rho)_n}{(n + \lambda)_n n!} \cdot {}_4F_3\left(\begin{matrix} -n, n + \lambda, \alpha, \beta \\ \sigma, \rho, \gamma \end{matrix}; 1\right) \\
&\quad \cdot z^n {}_2F_1(\sigma + n, \rho + n; \lambda + 1 + 2n; z),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

and to use appropriate reduction formulas for ${}_4F_3$ after specifying arguments to particular values.

Integral over half-space.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{2\alpha} |x|^{2\beta} |x - \hat{y}|^{2\gamma}} \\ &= \frac{\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha) \Gamma(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - \frac{d}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} - \alpha - \gamma) \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} - \alpha - \beta)}{2 \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(d - 2\alpha - \beta - \gamma)} \cdot \frac{1}{|\hat{y}|^{2\alpha+2\beta+2\gamma-d}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\beta \neq 0, \gamma \neq 0$ and the integral is over d -dimensional half-space:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} d^{d-1} \hat{x} \int_0^\infty dx_\perp. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Our starting point to derive (A.11) is to use Schwinger parametrization:

$$\frac{1}{x^\Delta} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\Delta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} t^\Delta e^{-tx}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

which allows to rewrite the left-hand side of (A.11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} d^d x \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{2\alpha} |x|^{2\beta} |x - \hat{y}|^{2\gamma}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(\gamma)} \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} s^\beta \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} t^\gamma e^{-\frac{st}{s+t} |\hat{y}|^2} \\ & \quad \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} d^{d-1} \hat{x} e^{-(s+t) |\hat{x} + \frac{t}{s+t} \hat{y}|^2} \int_0^\infty dx_\perp \frac{1}{|x_\perp|^{2\alpha}} e^{-(s+t) |x_\perp|^2} \\ &= \frac{\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \Gamma(1/2 - \alpha)}{2 \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(\gamma)} \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \cdot \frac{s^\beta t^\gamma e^{-\frac{st}{s+t} |\hat{y}|^2}}{(s+t)^{d/2-\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

The remaining integrals are doable by the change of integration variables $s = ru, t = r(1-u)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \cdot \frac{s^\beta t^\gamma e^{-\frac{st}{s+t} |\hat{y}|^2}}{(s+t)^{d/2-\alpha}} \\ &= \int_0^1 du u^{\beta-1} (1-u)^{\gamma-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{r} r^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma-d/2} e^{-ru(1-u) |\hat{y}|^2} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - \frac{d}{2})}{|\hat{y}|^{2\alpha+2\beta+2\gamma-d}} \int_0^1 du u^{d/2-\alpha-\gamma-1} (1-u)^{d/2-\alpha-\beta-1} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - \frac{d}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} - \alpha - \beta) \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} - \alpha - \gamma)}{\Gamma(d - 2\alpha - \beta - \gamma)} \cdot \frac{1}{|\hat{y}|^{2\alpha+2\beta+2\gamma-d}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Appendix B

A review of unitarity bound

We here leave a comprehensive review of unitarity bound from a Lorentzian perspective, which attracts much less attention since the original derivation due to [Mac77a, DMP⁺77] except a partial review by [KKSDZ19]. Interested readers are referred to [Min97] in which the author derives unitarity bound from the reflection positivity in Euclidean signature combined with the state/operator correspondence. Our approach relies only on the Wightman positivity of Lorentzian correlators. Hence, given the forms of correlation functions in CFT, we do not need conformal symmetry further to prove unitarity bound.¹

We first explain the analytic properties of correlation functions in Euclidean and Lorentzian QFTs following [Haa92, SW89] (section B.1). We then develop some group theoretical technologies in section B.2 and B.3. In section B.4, we perform Fourier transformation of two-point Lorentzian correlators. Section B.5 is for derivations of unitary bound for scalar primaries and symmetric traceless tensors.

¹One can apply our method to obtain positivity constraints in a class of quantum field theories that are scale invariant but not conformal invariant. Let us consider scalar two-point correlators as an illustration. Though one fails to have the orthogonality of scalar operators with different conformal dimensions without special conformal invariance, scale invariance is enough to fix the scalar two-point correlation function to have the following form in Euclidean signature:

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_1}(x_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_2}(x_2) \rangle = \frac{c(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_1}, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_2})}{|x_{12}|^{\Delta'_1 + \Delta'_2}}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where we have denoted the scaling dimension of the scalar operator $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta'_i}$ ($i = 1, 2$) by Δ'_i . By utilizing Wightman positivity, we end up with the same unitarity bound for the scaling dimensions $\Delta' \geq d/2 - 1$ as in CFTs (B.89).

B.1 Remarks on analytic properties of correlation functions in quantum field theory

Lorentzian correlators (Wightman distributions). Let us consider d -dimensional Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$ whose coordinates are denoted by $\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}}$ ($\tilde{\mu} = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$):

$$\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}} = (\tilde{x}^0, \tilde{x}^1, \dots, \tilde{x}^{d-1}) = (t, \vec{x}), \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

with the metric:

$$d^2\tilde{s} = \eta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} d\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}} d\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\nu}} = -dt^2 + d\vec{x}^2. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We denote an n -point scalar correlation function on $\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$ by:

$$W_n(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n) = \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_1) \mathcal{O}_2(\tilde{x}_2) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(\tilde{x}_n) | \Omega \rangle. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We require the vacuum of QFT $|\Omega\rangle$ to be invariant under Poincaré transformations, a semi-direct product of translations and Lorentz transformations: $\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1} \rtimes \text{SO}(1, d-1)$. That is, the QFT vacuum $|\Omega\rangle$ is annihilated by Poincaré generators $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{\tilde{\mu}} |\Omega\rangle = 0, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} |\Omega\rangle = 0, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

These generators are Hermitian: $(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}})^\dagger = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}}$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}})^\dagger = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}^{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}$ and the zero-th component of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}}$ is nothing but the Hamiltonian of the theory: $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^0 = H$. We further require the spectrum condition of the translation generators $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}}$ on any physical state $|\Psi\rangle$:

$$\langle \Psi | \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}} | \Psi \rangle \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Here, we have introduced an order between two Minkowski coordinates: $\tilde{x}_1^{\tilde{\mu}} \geq \tilde{x}_2^{\tilde{\mu}}$, meaning that $\tilde{x}_1^{\tilde{\mu}}$ is in the forward light-cone of $\tilde{x}_2^{\tilde{\mu}}$:

$$t_1 \geq t_2, \quad -\tilde{x}_{12}^2 = t_{12}^2 - |\vec{x}_{12}|^2 \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Lorentzian correlators are oscillatory and not convergent in general and are termed the Wightman or tempered distributions. However, one can regard them as boundary values of holomorphic functions. To see this, let us complexify the spacetime coordinates $\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}}$ as:

$$\tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}} = \xi^{\tilde{\mu}} - i\zeta^{\tilde{\mu}}, \quad \xi^{\tilde{\mu}}, \zeta^{\tilde{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

From the transformation properties of fields $\mathcal{O}(x) = e^{-i\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot \tilde{x}} \mathcal{O}(0) e^{+i\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot \tilde{x}}$, the n -point scalar correlation function $W_n(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n)$ can be expanded as:

$$\begin{aligned} W_n(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n) = \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_1(0) e^{i\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\xi_1 - \xi_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)} \mathcal{O}_2(0) e^{i\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\xi_2 - \xi_3) + \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\zeta_2 - \zeta_3)} \\ \dots e^{i\tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\xi_{n-1} - \xi_n) + \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cdot (\zeta_{n-1} - \zeta_n)} \mathcal{O}_n(0) | \Omega \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Then, the n -point Wightman distribution turns out to be convergent and holomorphic on the domain:

$$\zeta_1 > \zeta_2 > \cdots > \zeta_n, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

due to the exponentially dumping factors and the spectrum condition for $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{\tilde{\mu}}$ (B.6). Here, for coordinates on Minkowski space, $\tilde{x}_1 > \tilde{x}_2$ means that $t_1 > t_2$ and $-\tilde{x}_{12}^2 = t_{12}^2 - |\vec{x}_{12}|^2 > 0$. As we recover the un-complexified correlator by setting ζ_i 's to zero keeping the condition (B.10), we can regard the Lorentzian correlator $W_n(\tilde{x}_1, \cdots, \tilde{x}_n)$ as the boundary value of the holomorphic function.

To evaluate the tempered distributions, we must smear them with some test functions called Schwartz functions to get finite answers. Let $f(u)$ be a Schwartz function with one variable. Then, it is well-behaved functions satisfying the following property:

$$u^n \frac{\partial^m}{\partial u^m} f(u) \quad \text{is bounded above for arbitrary } n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Gaussian $f(u) = e^{-u^2}$ is one of the examples of such functions. Consider a general finite linear combination of quantum states created by acting operators on the vacuum and integrating them against Schwartz functions:

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d\tilde{x}_1 \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d\tilde{x}_n f_1(\tilde{x}_1) \cdots f_n(\tilde{x}_n) \mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(\tilde{x}_n) |\Omega\rangle. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

One can define the state conjugate to $|\Phi\rangle$ through the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Phi| &= [|\Phi\rangle]^\dagger \\ &= \sum_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d\tilde{x}_1 \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d\tilde{x}_n [f_1(\tilde{x}_1)]^* \cdots [f_n(\tilde{x}_n)]^* \langle\Omega| \mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(\tilde{x}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Wightman positivity requires that the norm of any quantum state be positive. Hence, one has the following positivity condition:

$$\langle\Phi|\Phi\rangle \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.14})$$

for arbitrary Schwartz functions $f_n(\tilde{x})$ ($n = 1, 2, \cdots$). In particular, for a state created by inserting a single operator on the vacuum, one has:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_2 [f(\tilde{x}_1)]^* f(\tilde{x}_2) \cdot \langle \mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_1) \mathcal{O}_2(\tilde{x}_2) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Analytic continuation to Euclidean signature: Schwinger functions. We also impose microcausality of the fields: any two local fields that are spacelike separated from each other must

commute (boson) or anti-commute (fermion) inside physical correlators. For scalar fields, we have:

$$[\mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_1), \mathcal{O}_2(\tilde{x}_2)] = 0 \quad \text{for } \tilde{x}_1 \approx \tilde{x}_2 \quad (\text{spacelike separated}) . \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Microcausality combined with (complex) Lorentz transformation and the edge-of-the-wedge theorem helps to extend the analytic domain (B.10) to the wider one including the Euclidean configuration $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}^E = (-i\tau, \vec{x})$ [OS73, OS75]. This allows to analytically continue the Wightman distribution $W_n(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n)$ to its Euclidean counterpart (Schwinger function):

$$S_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \equiv W_n(\tilde{x}_1^E, \dots, \tilde{x}_n^E) = \langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \mathcal{O}_2(x_2) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(x_n) \rangle , \quad (\text{B.17})$$

$$x_i^\mu = (\vec{x}_i, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d , \quad \mu = 1, \dots, d , \quad ds^2 = d\vec{x}^2 + d\tau^2 ,$$

which can be computed through the Euclidean path integral and enjoys the required properties of the Osterwalder-Schrader axioms [OS73, OS75].

Let us enumerate some features of Schwinger functions. Schwinger functions in $d \geq 2$ space-time dimension are invariant under any permutation of their arguments:

$$S_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = S_n(x_2, x_1, \dots, x_n) = \cdots = S_n(x_n, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_1) , \quad (\text{B.18})$$

and are analytic away from the coincidence of points. The permutation invariance (B.18) is inherited from the microcausality of the Wightman axiom. But, in the operator language, all operators should be Euclidean-time-ordered in line with the condition (B.10):²

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(x_n) \rangle = \langle \Omega | T_E \{ \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(x_n) \} | \Omega \rangle . \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction theorem. We have seen how to get Euclidean QFT correlators (Schwinger functions) from Lorentzian QFT correlators (Wightman distributions). There is indeed an inverse of this manipulation: reconstruction of Wightman distributions from Schwinger functions due to the Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction theorem [OS73, OS75]. According to this theorem, one can calculate a Wightman distribution with a particular ordering:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(x_n) | \Omega \rangle , \quad (\text{B.20})$$

in the following way: Start with Euclidean configuration with fixed ordering:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_1(\tilde{x}_{E,1}) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(\tilde{x}_{E,n}) | \Omega \rangle , \quad \tilde{x}_{E,i}^\mu = (-i\varepsilon_i, \vec{x}_{i,0}) , \quad (\text{B.21})$$

with $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \cdots > \varepsilon_n$ and arbitrary $\vec{x}_{i,0}$'s. Then, analytically continue the real parts of $\tilde{x}_{E,i}$'s to the given values: $\tilde{x}_{E,i} \rightarrow (t_i - i\varepsilon_i, \vec{x}_i)$ and take $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ limit, keeping the order of ε_i 's.

²See (2.28) for the definition of the symbol T_E that stands for Euclidean time ordering. We note that using the Euclidean Poincaré invariance $\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \text{SO}(d)$ of the Schwinger functions, we can rotate the Euclidean time axis. More precisely, because flat Euclidean spacetime \mathbb{R}^d has no preferred directions, we can choose any direction as the Euclidean time and align operators in arbitrary order. One should be aware that the situation is quite different in one-dimensional spacetime where the permutation invariance (B.18) does not hold due to the absence of spatial direction in Lorentzian spacetime.

B.2 Harmonic function and symmetric traceless tensor

Consider an $\text{SO}(n)$ symmetric and traceless tensor of rank- J : $f_{i_1 \dots i_J}$. We define its encoding polynomial by contracting it with auxiliary vectors $\vec{r} \in \mathbb{C}^n$:

$$f_J(\vec{r}) = f_{i_1 \dots i_J} r^{i_1} \dots r^{i_J}. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to the case $\vec{r} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, from which one can recover the argument for $\vec{r} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ by analytic continuation. This encoding polynomial is the homogeneous polynomial of degree- J in \vec{r} : $f_J(\lambda \vec{r}) = \lambda^J \cdot f_J(\vec{r})$. The tracelessness of the original tensor $f_{i_1 \dots i_J}$ turns into the absence of the terms that are proportional to $r^2 = \vec{r} \cdot \vec{r}$ in $f_J(\vec{r})$, implying that $f_J(\vec{r})$ must be some harmonic function in d -dimensional flat spacetime:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{r}} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{r}} f_J(\vec{r}) = \square_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_J(\vec{r}) = 0. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Here, we denoted the Laplace operator in n -dimensional flat spacetime by $\square_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. We remark that according to the theorem presented in section 2 of [BT77] and appendix A of [DMP⁺77], there is a one-to-one correspondence between harmonic functions in n -dimension with homogeneity of degree- J and rank- J $\text{SO}(n)$ symmetric and traceless tensors.

Using the homogeneity of the encoding polynomials, we now define the re-scaled function depending only on the coordinate in $(n-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere $\vec{\Omega}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$:

$$\hat{f}_J(\vec{\Omega}_{n-1}) = r^{-J} \cdot f_J(\vec{r}), \quad \vec{r} = r \cdot \vec{\Omega}_{n-1}, \quad |\vec{\Omega}_{n-1}| = 1. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Then, the Laplace equation (B.23) reduces to:³

$$[\square_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} + J(J+n-2)] \hat{f}_J(\vec{\Omega}_{n-1}) = 0, \quad (\text{B.27})$$

with $\square_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ being the Laplacian of \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .

Let us consider the simplest case where the re-scaled encoding polynomial $\hat{f}_J(\vec{\Omega}_{n-1})$ depends only on the single angular variable $\cos \theta$. Then, the differential equation (B.27) takes the form of

³Recall that the Laplacian of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ acts on some scalar function $f(\vec{r})$ as:

$$\square_g f = \frac{1}{|\det g|^{1/2}} \cdot \partial_\mu \left(|\det g|^{1/2} \cdot g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu f \right). \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Because the flat space metric in the radial coordinate system is given by $ds_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 = dr^2 + r^2 ds_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}^2$, we have:

$$\square_{\mathbb{R}^n} f = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}} \cdot \partial_r (r^{n-1} \partial_r f) + \frac{1}{r^2} \cdot \square_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

the Gegenbauer differential equation:⁴

$$\left[(1-t^2) \cdot \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - (n-1) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + J(J+n-2) \right] \cdot \hat{f}_J(t) = 0, \quad (\text{B.29})$$

with $t = \cos \theta$. The solution regular on the interval $-1 \leq \cos \theta \leq 1$ is given by:

$$\hat{f}_J(\cos \theta) \propto C_J^{n/2-1}(\cos \theta), \quad (\text{B.30})$$

Here, $C_n^\nu(x)$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) is the Gegenbauer polynomial:

$$C_n^\nu(x) = \frac{(2\nu)_n}{n!} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(-n, 2\nu + n; \nu + \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1-x}{2} \right) = \frac{2^n (\nu)_n}{n!} \cdot x^n + \dots \quad (\text{B.31})$$

satisfying the following orthogonality condition:

$$\int_0^\pi d\theta (\sin \theta)^{2\nu} \cdot C_n^\nu(\cos \theta) C_m^\nu(\cos \theta) = \frac{\pi \Gamma(n+2\nu)}{2^{2\nu-1} (n+\nu) \Gamma^2(\nu) n!} \delta_{n,m}. \quad (\text{B.32})$$

B.3 Decomposition of $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetric and traceless projector

In this section, we argue a way to decompose $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetric and traceless tensor onto $\text{SO}(d-1)$ symmetric and traceless substructures that stabilize one future-directed time-like vector $\tilde{p} > 0$ ($\tilde{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$) [DMP⁺77]. We here do this decomposition focusing on the properties of orthogonal polynomials. See [DMP⁺77, section 2.A] for more on the group-theoretical argument on the validity of this decomposition.

First of all, let us summarize the formal properties of the $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetric and traceless projector of rank- J :

$$\text{Symmetry : } \quad \Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J} = \Pi_{\{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J\}; \{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J\}}, \quad (\text{B.33})$$

$$\text{Tracelessness : } \quad \eta^{\tilde{\mu}_1 \tilde{\mu}_2} \Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J} = 0, \quad (\text{B.34})$$

$$\text{Idempotence : } \quad \Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J} \Pi_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{\tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J} = \Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}, \quad (\text{B.35})$$

where the indices in the braces $\{\bullet, \dots, \bullet\}$ are symmetrized. For the $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetric traceless projector $\Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}$ of rank- J , we are interested in the following decomposition:

$$\Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J} = \sum_{l=0}^J \hat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}). \quad (\text{B.36})$$

⁴We used the fact that $\square_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ is the Laplacian associated with the metric $ds_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}^2 = d\theta^2 + (\sin \theta)^2 ds_{\mathbb{S}^{n-2}}^2$ whose action on $f(\vec{r})$ can be computed recursively using the formula (B.25):

$$\square_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f = \frac{1}{(\sin \theta)^{n-2}} \partial_\theta \cdot [(\sin \theta)^{n-2} \partial_\theta f] + \frac{1}{(\sin \theta)^2} \cdot \square_{\mathbb{S}^{n-2}} f. \quad (\text{B.28})$$

Here, $\widehat{\Pi}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p})$ ($l = 0, 1, \dots, J$) is a projector onto $\text{SO}(d-1)$ symmetric and traceless subspace that leaves \tilde{p} invariant. We introduced the unit-normalized future-directed vector \hat{p} :

$$\hat{p}^{\tilde{\mu}} = \frac{\tilde{p}^{\tilde{\mu}}}{\sqrt{-\tilde{p}^2}}, \quad \hat{p}^2 = -1. \quad (\text{B.37})$$

The projectors $\widehat{\Pi}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p})$ are subject to the similar properties to $\Pi_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}$:

$$\text{Symmetry :} \quad \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) = \widehat{\Pi}_{\{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J\}; \{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J\}}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}), \quad (\text{B.38})$$

$$\text{Tracelessness :} \quad \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\tilde{\mu}_1 \tilde{\mu}_2} \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) = 0, \quad (\text{B.39})$$

$$\text{Idempotence :} \quad \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l); \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J}(\hat{p}) = \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}), \quad (\text{B.40})$$

but the tracelessness is restated against the reduced metric onto the directions orthogonal to \tilde{p} :

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = \eta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} - \frac{\tilde{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}\tilde{p}_{\tilde{\nu}}}{\tilde{p}^2} = \eta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} + \hat{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}\hat{p}_{\tilde{\nu}}, \quad \tilde{p}^{\tilde{\mu}} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = 0. \quad (\text{B.41})$$

In addition to this, we require the orthogonality of the projectors having different degrees:

$$\text{Orthogonality :} \quad \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l'); \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J}(\hat{p}) = 0 \quad \text{for } l \neq l'. \quad (\text{B.42})$$

We also make $\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\rho}_1 \dots \tilde{\rho}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p})$ such that, for $1 \leq l \leq J$, it is annihilated when contracted with \hat{p} ($J-l+1$)-times or more:

$$\text{Nilpotency :} \quad \hat{p}^{\tilde{\mu}_1} \dots \hat{p}^{\tilde{\mu}_J} \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq J. \quad (\text{B.43})$$

When $J = l$, the nilpotency condition (B.43) takes the much simpler form to give:

$$\hat{p}^{\tilde{\mu}_1} \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_l; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_l}^{(l,l)}(\hat{p}) = 0. \quad (\text{B.44})$$

Hence, we can regard $\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_l; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_l}^{(l,l)}(\hat{p})$ as an $\text{SO}(d-1)$ symmetric and traceless projector of rank- l in the effectively $(d-1)$ -dimensional spacelike subspace orthogonal to the timelike direction \hat{p} . Bearing this in mind, it is indeed possible to construct $\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p})$ satisfying all the requirements above up to a proportionality constant $c_{J,l}$, to be determined from (B.36) (or equivalently (B.40)):

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l); \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}(\hat{p}) = c_{J,l} \cdot \hat{p}_{\{\tilde{\mu}_{l+1} \dots \tilde{\mu}_J\}} \cdot \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_l}^{(l,l); \{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_l\}}(\hat{p}) \cdot \hat{p}^{\tilde{\nu}_{l+1}} \dots \hat{p}^{\tilde{\nu}_J}. \quad (\text{B.45})$$

To fix the coefficient $c_{J,l}$, we contract each set of indices in the above expression with two null vectors $z_{\alpha=1,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$ with $z_{\alpha}^2 = 0$ and translate them into the language of encoding polynomials. Firstly, the decomposition (B.36) turns into:

$$(z_1 \cdot z_2)^J = \sum_{l=0}^J f^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2), \quad (\text{B.46})$$

where $f^{J,l}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree- J both in z_1 and z_2 :

$$f^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2) = z_1^{\mu_1} \cdots z_1^{\mu_J} \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \cdots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \cdots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) z_2^{\nu_1} \cdots z_2^{\nu_J}. \quad (\text{B.47})$$

Let us first focus on the simplest case $J = l$. From (B.39) and (B.44), the encoding polynomial $f^{l,l}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2)$ should behave as a harmonic function of degree- l both in $z_{1;\mu}$ and in $z_{2;\mu}$ with $z_{i;\mu} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mu\nu} z_i^\nu$ ($i = 1, 2$) on the effectively $(d-1)$ -dimensional spacetime orthogonal to \hat{p} . Besides, other dependence comes only from the angle θ between $z_{1;\mu}$ and $z_{2;\mu}$ with $\cos \theta = \frac{z_1 \cdot z_2}{|z_1||z_2|}$. Therefore, $f^{(l,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2)$ can be expressed as follows (see appendix B.2 for details on harmonic functions):⁵

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(l,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2) &= c_{l,l} \cdot \frac{l! (|z_1||z_2|)^l}{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l} \cdot C_l^{\left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{z_1 \cdot z_2}{|z_1||z_2|} \right) \\ &= c_{l,l} \cdot \frac{l! (-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})^l (-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})^l}{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l} \cdot C_l^{\left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)} \left(1 - \frac{-z_1 \cdot z_2}{(-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})(-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Employing the explicit form of (B.49) together with (B.45) and (B.47), we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2) &= c_{J,l} \cdot (-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})^{J-l} (-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})^{J-l} \cdot f^{(l,l)}(\hat{p}, z_1, z_2) \\ &= c_{J,l} \cdot \frac{l! (-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})^J (-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})^J}{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l} \cdot C_l^{\left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)} \left(1 - \frac{-z_1 \cdot z_2}{(-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})(-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.50})$$

Then, our remaining task is to determine the normalization constant $c_{J,l}$. Setting $\hat{p} = (1, \vec{0})$, $z_i = (1, \vec{n}_i)$ with $\vec{n}_1 \cdot \vec{n}_2 = \cos \theta$, the completeness relation in terms of encoding polynomials (B.46) becomes:

$$(-1)^J \cdot (1 - \cos \theta)^J = \sum_{l=0}^J c_{J,l} \cdot \frac{l!}{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l} \cdot C_l^{\left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)}(\cos \theta). \quad (\text{B.51})$$

Comparing this expression with the identity:⁶

$$(1 - \cos \theta)^m = \sum_{n=0}^m \frac{(-1)^n 2^m (2n+2\nu) (\nu+1/2)_m m!}{(2\nu)_{m+n+1} (m-n)!} \cdot C_n^\nu(\cos \theta), \quad (\text{B.52})$$

we eventually find that:

$$c_{J,l} = (-1)^{J-l} \cdot \frac{2^J (d-3+2l) (d/2-1)_J J!}{(d-3)_{J+l+1} (J-l)!} \cdot \frac{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l}{l!}. \quad (\text{B.53})$$

⁵One can fix the overall coefficient to match the leading behavior in $(z_1 \cdot z_2)^s$. See (B.31) for the definition of the Gegenbauer polynomial. The last line follows from the following identities:

$$z_i^\mu = -(z_i \cdot \hat{p}) \hat{p}^\mu + z_i^\mu, \quad |z_i| = (-z_i \cdot \hat{p}), \quad z_1 \cdot z_2 = (z_1 \cdot z_2) + (z_1 \cdot \hat{p})(z_2 \cdot \hat{p}). \quad (\text{B.48})$$

⁶We can prove this identity by using integration formula such as [Zwi14, equation (7.391.4)] combined with [Zwi14, equation (8.962.4)] and the orthogonality of the Gegenbauer polynomials (B.32).

B.4 Fourier transformation of two-point Wightman distributions

We here review how to perform Fourier transformations of two-point Wightman distributions. As a warm-up, we start with the scalar case and move on to spinning operators.

Scalar primary. We now derive the momentum space expression of the two-point function of scalar primaries:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_2) | \Omega \rangle . \quad (\text{B.54})$$

Here, the momentum space operator $\mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p})$ is related to $\mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{x})$ by the following Fourier transformation:

$$\mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x} e^{i\tilde{p}\cdot\tilde{x}} \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{x}) . \quad (\text{B.55})$$

Because of the translational invariance of the vacuum, we can extract the momentum conservation factor from the scalar two-point function:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_2) | \Omega \rangle = (2\pi)^d \delta^d(\tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d x e^{-i\tilde{p}_2\cdot\tilde{x}} \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(0) | \Omega \rangle . \quad (\text{B.56})$$

Then, we are left to calculate the following integral:⁷

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d x e^{-i\tilde{p}\cdot\tilde{x}} \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(0) | \Omega \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d x \frac{e^{-i\tilde{p}\cdot\tilde{x}}}{[-(t-i\varepsilon)^2 + |\tilde{x}|^2]^\Delta} . \quad (\text{B.57})$$

In what follows, we compute the Lorentzian correlator from Euclidean counterpart from analytic continuation by introducing infinitesimal positive number ε .

We start with the identity:⁸

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x \frac{e^{-i x \cdot q}}{(x^2)^\Delta} = \frac{2^{d-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta)}{\Gamma(\Delta)} (q^2)^{\Delta-d/2} , \quad q \in \mathbb{R}^d . \quad (\text{B.59})$$

⁷Throughout this chapter, we unit-normalize two-point functions of primary operators (2.81). We used the Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction theorem (see appendix B.1) to obtain the Lorentzian correlator in position space.

⁸One can confirm this identity as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x \frac{e^{-i x \cdot q}}{(x^2)^\Delta} &= \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-2}) \cdot \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dr r^{d-1-2\Delta} e^{-i|q|r \cos \theta} \\ &= \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{d-2}) \cdot \int_0^{\pi/2} d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dr r^{d-1-2\Delta} \cdot (e^{+i|q|r \cos \theta} + e^{-i|q|r \cos \theta}) \\ &= \frac{2^{d-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta)}{\Gamma(\Delta)} \cdot (q^2)^{\Delta-d/2} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.58})$$

Inverting this, we find that:

$$\frac{1}{(x^2)^\Delta} = \frac{2^{d-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta)}{\Gamma(\Delta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} e^{iq \cdot x} (q^2)^{\Delta-d/2}. \quad (\text{B.60})$$

We give a positive imaginary part to the d -th component of x : $x^\mu = (\vec{x}, \varepsilon + i t)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$, and deform the integration contour of (B.60) in the complex p^d -plane to pick up the discontinuity on the positive imaginary axis. Using the relation:⁹

$$(x + i 0)^\lambda - (x - i 0)^\lambda = 2i \sin \pi \lambda \cdot (-x)^\lambda \cdot \Theta(-x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{B.61})$$

we find that:

$$\frac{1}{[-(t - i\varepsilon)^2 + |\vec{x}|^2]^\Delta} = \frac{\pi^{d/2+1} 2^{d-2\Delta+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta) \Gamma(\Delta - \frac{d-2}{2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^d \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\tilde{p} \cdot \tilde{x}} (-\tilde{p}^2)^{\Delta-d/2} \Theta(p), \quad (\text{B.62})$$

where $\Theta(p) = \Theta(-p^2) \Theta(p^0)$ is a generalized function that returns one if $p > 0$ and otherwise zero. Inverting this again, one ends up with the following expression:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{p}_2) | \Omega \rangle = (2\pi)^d \delta^d(\tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2) \cdot \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta) \Gamma(\Delta - \frac{d-2}{2})} \cdot (-\tilde{p}^2)^{\Delta-d/2} \Theta(\tilde{p}). \quad (\text{B.63})$$

In one-dimensional Minkowski spacetime, employing analytic continuation, one finds that the two-point function of scalar primaries is given by:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(t_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(t_2) | \Omega \rangle = \frac{1}{(\varepsilon + i t_{12})^{2\Delta}}, \quad (\text{B.64})$$

Performing appropriate contour deformation, we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(E_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(E_2) | \Omega \rangle &= 2\pi \delta(E_1 + E_2) \cdot \int dt e^{iE_2 t} \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(t) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(0) | \Omega \rangle \\ &= 2\pi \delta(E_1 + E_2) \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\Gamma(2\Delta)} \cdot E_2^{2\Delta-1} \Theta(E_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.65})$$

Symmetric and traceless tensor. We unit-normalize the two-point Wightman function of traceless symmetric tensors of rank- J (2.82) and contract it with polarization vectors $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$ with $z_i^2 = 0, z_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta,J}(\tilde{x}_1, z_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta,J}(\tilde{x}_2, z_2) | \Omega \rangle = \frac{[\tilde{x}_{12}^2 (z_1 \cdot z_2) - 2(x_{12} \cdot z_1)(\tilde{x}_{12} \cdot z_2)]^J}{[-(t_{12} - i\varepsilon)^2 + |\vec{x}_{12}|^2]^{\Delta+J}}. \quad (\text{B.66})$$

It is in general possible to decompose $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$ as:

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{\tilde{x} \cdot z_2}{z_1 \cdot z_2} z_1 + \frac{\tilde{x} \cdot z_1}{z_1 \cdot z_2} z_2 + \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{x} \cdot z_1 = \mathbf{x} \cdot z_2 = 0. \quad (\text{B.67})$$

⁹The symbol $\Theta(x)$ stands for the Heaviside step function with $\Theta(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $\Theta(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$.

Then, (B.66) takes the form:

$$\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_1, z_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_2, z_2) | \Omega \rangle = \frac{(-1)^J (-z_1 \cdot z_2)^J (\mathbf{x}^2)^J}{[-(t_{12} - i\epsilon_{12})^2 + |\vec{x}_{12}|^2]^{\Delta+J}}, \quad (\text{B.68})$$

whose Fourier transformation is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_1, z_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_2, z_2) | \Omega \rangle \\ &= (2\pi)^d \delta^d(p_1 + p_2) \cdot (-1)^J (-z_1 \cdot z_2)^J \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1, d-1}} d^d x e^{-i\tilde{p}_2 \cdot \tilde{x}} \frac{(\mathbf{x}^2)^J}{[-(t - i\epsilon)^2 + |\vec{x}|^2]^{\Delta+J}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.69})$$

To perform the integral, similarly to the case for scalar primaries, we begin by calculating its Euclidean counterpart:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x e^{-i q \cdot x} \frac{(\mathbf{x}^2)^J}{(x^2)^{\Delta+J}} = \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}} \right)^J \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d^d x e^{-i q \cdot x} \frac{1}{(x^2)^{\Delta+J}} \\ &= \frac{2^{d-2\Delta-2J} \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta - J)}{\Gamma(\Delta + J)} \cdot (-1)^J \cdot \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial |\mathbf{q}|^2} + \frac{d-3}{|\mathbf{q}|} \frac{\partial}{\partial |\mathbf{q}|} \right)^J (q^2)^{\Delta+J-d/2} \\ &= \frac{2^{d-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta - J) (\Delta + 1 - \frac{d}{2})_J (\frac{d}{2} - \Delta)_J}{\Gamma(\Delta + J)} \\ & \quad \cdot (q^2)^J (q^2)^{\Delta-J-d/2} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -J, 1 - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \\ \Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \end{matrix}; \frac{q^2}{\mathbf{q}^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.70})$$

We used (B.59) and (B.26) in going from the first to the second line. One can verify the last line from the principle of mathematical induction. Inverting this Fourier integral and performing contour deformation on the complex q^d -plane leads:¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\mathbf{x}^2)^J}{[-(t - i\epsilon)^2 + |\vec{x}|^2]^{\Delta+J}} = \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \\ & \quad \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1, d-1}} d^d \tilde{p} e^{i\tilde{p} \cdot \tilde{x}} \Theta(\tilde{p}) (-\tilde{p}^2)^{\Delta-J-d/2} (\mathbf{p}^2 - \tilde{p}^2)^J \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -J, \Delta - 1 \\ \Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \end{matrix}; \frac{\tilde{p}^2}{\tilde{p}^2 - \mathbf{p}^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.73})$$

We then plug the above expression into (B.69) and do the following replacement:

$$\mathbf{p}^2 - \tilde{p}^2 \mapsto -\frac{2(-\tilde{p} \cdot z_1)(-\tilde{p} \cdot z_2)}{(-z_1 \cdot z_2)}, \quad (\text{B.74})$$

¹⁰We remark that, as J is an integer, the hypergeometric function here is a polynomial and has no branch cuts. The following identities will be useful to derive (B.73):

$$\frac{2\pi (-1)^J}{\Gamma(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2})} = 2 \sin \pi(d/2 - \Delta + J) \Gamma(d/2 - \Delta - J) \left(\Delta + 1 - \frac{d}{2} \right)_J \left(\frac{d}{2} - \Delta \right)_J, \quad (\text{B.71})$$

$${}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) = (1-z)^{-\alpha} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\alpha, \gamma - \beta; \gamma; \frac{z}{z-1} \right). \quad (\text{B.72})$$

After inverting the Fourier transformation, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{p}_1, z_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{p}_2, z_2) | \Omega \rangle \\
&= (2\pi)^d \delta^d(\tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2) \Theta(\tilde{p}_2) (-\tilde{p}_2^2)^{\Delta - J - d/2} \cdot \frac{\pi^{d/2+1} 2^{d+1-2\Delta+J} (-\tilde{p}_2 \cdot z_1)^J (-\tilde{p}_2 \cdot z_2)^J}{\Gamma(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \\
&\quad \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -J, \Delta - 1 \\ \Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \end{matrix}; \frac{(-\tilde{p}_2^2) (-z_1 \cdot z_2)}{2(-\tilde{p}_2 \cdot z_1)(-\tilde{p}_2 \cdot z_2)} \right). \tag{B.75}
\end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to focus on the tensor structure of the two-point correlator of $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetric traceless tensors of rank- J (B.75), where the dependence on the future directed time-like vector $\tilde{p}_2 > 0$ breaks $\text{SO}(1, d-1)$ symmetry down to $\text{SO}(d-1)$. From this perspective, it would be nicer to project out the tensor structure onto $\text{SO}(d-1)$ symmetric and traceless sub-structures that keep $\hat{p}_2 = \tilde{p}_2 / \sqrt{-\tilde{p}_2^2}$ invariant (see appendix B.3 for details of this projection):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{p}_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{p}_2) | \Omega \rangle \\
&= (2\pi)^d \delta^d(\tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2) \Theta(-\tilde{p}_2^2) \Theta(\tilde{p}_2) (-\tilde{p}_2^2)^{\Delta - d/2} \sum_{l=0}^J \mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J) \cdot \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J, l)}(\hat{p}_2). \tag{B.76}
\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_1, z_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, J}(\tilde{x}_2, z_2) | \Omega \rangle &= (2\pi)^d \delta^d(\tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2) \Theta(-\tilde{p}_2^2) \Theta(\tilde{p}_2) (-\tilde{p}_2^2)^{\Delta - d/2} \\
&\quad \cdot \sum_{l=0}^J \mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J) \cdot \frac{(-1)^{J-l} 2^J (d-3+2l) (d/2-1)_J J!}{(d-3)_{J+l+1} (J-l)!} \\
&\quad \cdot C_l^{(d-3)} \left(1 - \frac{-z_1 \cdot z_2}{(-z_1 \cdot \hat{p})(-z_2 \cdot \hat{p})} \right). \tag{B.77}
\end{aligned}$$

To fix the expansion coefficients $\mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J)$ ($l = 0, 1, \dots, J$) in (B.76), we make the following specification of parameters:

$$\tilde{p}_2 = -\tilde{p}_1 = (1, \vec{0}), \quad z_1 = (1, \vec{n}_1), \quad z_2 = (1, \vec{n}_2), \quad \vec{n}_1 \cdot \vec{n}_2 = \cos \theta. \tag{B.78}$$

Under this specification, the hypergeometric function in the second line of (B.75) turns into a polynomial of degree- J in $\cos \theta$. Moreover, one can expand it in terms of Gegenbauer polynomials

of lower degrees:¹¹

(second line of (B.75))

$$\begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{\text{under (B.78)}} \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta+J} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -J, \Delta - 1 \\ \Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \end{matrix}; \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} \right) \\ & = \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta+J} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \\ & \quad \times \sum_{l=0}^J \frac{(d-3+2l)(d/2-1)_J (\Delta-1)_l (\Delta-J-d+2)_{J-l} J!}{(d-3)_{J+l+1} (\Delta-J-\frac{d-2}{2})_J (J-l)!} \cdot C_l^{(\frac{d-3}{2})}(\cos \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.83})$$

Comparing (B.77) with (B.83), one concludes that:

$$\mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J) = \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \cdot (-1)^{J-l} (\Delta-1)_l (\Delta-J-d+2)_{J-l}. \quad (\text{B.84})$$

B.5 Unitarity bound from Wightman positivity

Using the results we obtained, we derive unitarity bound from Wightman positivity.

Scalar primary. Wightman positivity (B.15) requires that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_2 [f(\tilde{x}_1)]^* f(\tilde{x}_2) \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{x}_1) \mathcal{O}_\Delta(\tilde{x}_2) | \Omega \rangle \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.85})$$

¹¹One has the following expressions for the polynomial that appears in the second line of (B.77) and the Gegenbauer polynomial (B.31) in terms of the Jacobi polynomials:

$${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -J, \Delta - 1 \\ \Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2} \end{matrix}; \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} \right) = \frac{J!}{(\Delta - J - \frac{d-2}{2})_J} \cdot P_J^{(\Delta - J - d/2, d/2 - 2)}(\cos \theta), \quad (\text{B.79})$$

$$C_n^\nu(x) = \frac{(2\nu)_n}{(\nu + 1/2)_n} \cdot P_n^{(\nu - 1/2, \nu - 1/2)}(x), \quad (\text{B.80})$$

where we used the standard definition of the Jacobi polynomial [Zwi14, equation (8.962.1)]:

$$P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = \frac{(\alpha + 1)_n}{n!} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, n + \alpha + \beta + 1 \\ 1 + \alpha \end{matrix}; \frac{1 - x}{2} \right). \quad (\text{B.81})$$

Use the orthogonality of the Gegenbauer polynomials (B.32) to reach the last line of (B.77). The following integral formula will be of great use [Zwi14, equation (7.391.9)]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-1}^1 dx (1-x)^\rho (1+x)^\beta P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) P_m^{(\rho, \beta)}(x) \\ & = \frac{2^{\beta+\rho+1} \Gamma(\alpha + \beta + m + n + 1) \Gamma(\beta + n + 1) \Gamma(\rho + m + 1) \Gamma(\alpha - \rho - m + n)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta + n + 1) \Gamma(\beta + \rho + m + n + 2) \Gamma(\alpha - \rho) m! (n - m)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.82})$$

with $f(\tilde{x})$ being a Schwartz function. It is rather convenient to see the positivity condition (B.85) in momentum space:

$$\frac{\pi^{d/2+1} 2^{d+1-2\Delta}}{\Gamma(\Delta)\Gamma(\Delta - \frac{d-2}{2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^d \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^d} |\tilde{f}(\tilde{p})|^2 (-\tilde{p}^2)^{\Delta-d/2} \Theta(\tilde{p}^0) \Theta(-\tilde{p}^2) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.86})$$

We denote by $\tilde{f}(\tilde{p})$ the momentum space expression of the Schwartz function defined through the relation:¹²

$$f(\tilde{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^d \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^d} e^{-i\tilde{p}\cdot\tilde{x}} \tilde{f}(\tilde{p}). \quad (\text{B.87})$$

When $d > 2$, this inequality (B.86) is achieved for $\Delta > \frac{d-2}{2}$, and even for $\Delta = \frac{d-2}{2}$ with special attention to the identity for tempered distributions $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon x^{\epsilon-1} \Theta(x) = \delta(x)$:¹³

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow \frac{d-2}{2}} (\text{left-hand side of (B.86)}) = \frac{2^3 \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\frac{d-2}{2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} |\tilde{f}(\tilde{p})|^2 \delta(-\tilde{p}^2) \Theta(\tilde{p}^0) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.88})$$

This inequality implies that scalar primary operators having conformal dimensions equal to the canonical (engineering) ones ($d/2 - 1$) satisfy the massless free Klein-Gordon equations.

Scalar primaries must not have conformal dimensions less than the canonical ones, in which the momentum integral (B.86) becomes singular near the origin $|p^2| \rightarrow 0$ and indefinite, resulting in a contradiction with Wightman positivity. Hence, the necessary and sufficient condition for Wightman positivity is:

$$\Delta \geq \frac{d-2}{2} \quad \text{for scalar primaries in } d > 2 \text{ dimensions,} \quad (\text{B.89})$$

and the equality is satisfied by Klein-Gordon fields, whose momenta are on the forward light cone.

In two-dimensions ($d = 2$), Wightman positivity requires $\Delta \geq 0$:

$$\frac{\pi^2 2^{3-2\Delta}}{\Gamma(\Delta)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^2 \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^2} |\tilde{f}(\tilde{p})|^2 (\tilde{p}^+ \tilde{p}^-)^{\Delta-1} \Theta(\tilde{p}^+) \Theta(\tilde{p}^-) \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.90})$$

where we have introduced light-cone momentum $\tilde{p}^\pm = \tilde{p}^0 \pm \tilde{p}^1$. When $\Delta = 0$, we have:

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} (\text{left-hand side of (B.90)}) = \pi^2 2^{3-2\Delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^2 \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^2} |\tilde{f}(\tilde{p})|^2 \delta(\tilde{p}^+) \delta(\tilde{p}^-) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.91})$$

Hence, the corresponding operator has zero energy and can be identified with the identity operator 1. Similarly in one-dimension ($d = 1$), Wightman positivity for scalar two-point function (B.65) gives:

$$\frac{2\pi}{\Gamma(2\Delta)} \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} |\tilde{f}(E)|^2 E^{2\Delta-1} \Theta(E) \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.92})$$

¹²Note that the Fourier-transformed Schwartz functions are also Schwartz functions.

¹³This distributional identity can be shown by performing the Fourier transform for both sides.

tending to the following expression in the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$:

$$2\pi \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} |\tilde{f}(E)|^2 \delta(E) \geq 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \Delta = 0. \quad (\text{B.93})$$

Thus, we have

$$\Delta \geq 0 \quad \text{for scalar primaries in } d = 1, 2 \text{ dimensions.} \quad (\text{B.94})$$

and the equality is satisfied by the identity operator **1**.

Symmetric and traceless tensor. In the same way as the scalar case, Wightman positivity demands that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} d^d \tilde{x}_2 [f^{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{x}_1)]^* f^{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}(\tilde{x}_2) \cdot \langle \Omega | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{x}_1) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}(\tilde{x}_2) | \Omega \rangle \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.95})$$

in position space. In momentum space, this inequality takes the following form:

$$\sum_{l=0}^J (-1)^{J-l} \mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}} \frac{d^d \tilde{p}}{(2\pi)^d} \Theta(-\tilde{p}^2) \Theta(\tilde{p}^0) (-\tilde{p}^2)^{\Delta-d/2} \cdot (-1)^{J-l} [f^{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{p})]^* f^{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}(\tilde{p}) \cdot \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p}) \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.96})$$

where the coefficients $\mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J)$ ($l = 0, 1, \dots, J$) are given in (B.84). We introduced the Schwartz function carrying spin indices $f^{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{x})$. Plugging the explicit form of $\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(J,l)}(\hat{p})$ given in (B.45) and (B.53) into this expression (B.96), we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{second line of (B.96)}) &= \frac{2^J (d-3+2l) (d/2-1)_J J!}{(d-3)_{J+l+1} (J-l)!} \cdot \frac{2^l \left(\frac{d-3}{2}\right)_l}{l!} \\ &\cdot [f^{\{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J\}}(\tilde{p}) \cdot \hat{p}_{\tilde{\mu}_{l+1}} \dots \hat{p}_{\tilde{\mu}_J}]^* \cdot \widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_l; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_l}^{(l,l)}(\hat{p}) \cdot [f^{\{\tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J\}}(\tilde{p}) \cdot \hat{p}_{\tilde{\nu}_{l+1}} \dots \hat{p}_{\tilde{\nu}_J}], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.97})$$

Because $\widehat{\Pi}_{\tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J; \tilde{\nu}_1 \dots \tilde{\nu}_J}^{(l,l)}(\hat{p})$ is the $\text{SO}(d-1)$ symmetric and traceless projector of rank l onto the $(d-1)$ -dimensional spacelike subspace, the second line of (B.96) is nothing but the absolute value of some complex function and is positive for arbitrary $f^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_J}(\tilde{x})$.

Therefore, the necessary and sufficient conditions for Wightman positivity come from the first line of (B.96):

$$(-1)^{J-l} \mathcal{A}_l(\Delta, J) = \frac{2^{d+1-2\Delta} \pi^{d/2+1}}{\Gamma(\Delta - \frac{d-2}{2}) \Gamma(\Delta + J)} \cdot (\Delta-1)_l (\Delta - J - d + 2)_{J-l} \geq 0, \quad (\text{B.98})$$

for $0 \leq l \leq J$. The condition sufficient for this inequality (B.98) is to require all arguments to be positive:

$$\Delta \geq J + d - 2 \quad \text{for spin-} J \text{ symmetric and traceless tensors.} \quad (\text{B.99})$$

When the conformal dimension saturates this bound, we have:

$$(\Delta - J - d + 2)_{J-l} \xrightarrow{\Delta \rightarrow J+d-2} (0)_{J-l} = \delta_{J,l} \quad (\text{B.100})$$

Consequently, only $l = J$ component $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_J; \nu_1 \dots \nu_J}^{(J,J)}(\hat{p})$ survives. Then, the nilpotency condition (B.44) implies the conservation law:

$$\tilde{p}^{\tilde{\mu}_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{p}) = 0 \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \tilde{\partial}^{\tilde{\mu}_1} \mathcal{O}_{\Delta, \tilde{\mu}_1 \dots \tilde{\mu}_J}(\tilde{x}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \Delta = J + d - 2. \quad (\text{B.101})$$

One still has some parameter regions where the inequality (B.98) can possibly be satisfied. However, one hits the singularity in the momentum space integral (B.96) near the light cone $\tilde{p}^2 = 0$ and fails to have a finite value. Therefore, we conclude that the necessary and sufficient condition for Wightman positivity for symmetric and traceless tensors is (B.99).

Appendix C

Conformal block expansion of bulk-defect-defect three-point function

In this appendix, we derive the conformal block expansion of bulk-defect-defect three-point functions consisting of a bulk scalar primary and two $SO(d - p)$ singlet defect scalars in two ways: One is to sum the DOE of a bulk scalar to all orders. The other is to solve the Casimir differential equation using the leading behavior of the DOE as its boundary condition. The authors of [KS18] firstly carried out this conformal block expansion for the case of BCFT in appendix A of their paper, but with errors in choosing proper boundary conditions for the Casimir equation. Their derivation is corrected and generalized to DCFT in [LLVRZ20, appendix C] by summing over the DOE to all orders.

C.1 Derivation using Defect Operator Expansion

In what follows, we derive the conformal block expansion of the bulk-defect-defect three-point function by applying the DOE of the bulk scalar (3.70) inside the correlator. First of all, notice that, of all the possible terms in the DOE of the bulk scalar, only $SO(d - p)$ singlet defect scalar primaries can contribute to the three-point functions, as the defect three-point function of the form $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \dots i_s} \rangle$ must be zero identically due to the defect conformal invariance (3.45).

We start by performing Fourier transformation for defect local operators $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x)$ with respect to parallel coordinates to the defect:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}) = \int \frac{d^p \hat{q}}{(2\pi)^p} e^{i \hat{q} \cdot \hat{x}} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{q}) . \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Then, the scalar channel DOE of $\mathcal{O}_\Delta(x)$ can be rewritten as follows:¹

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \supset & \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})}{|x_\perp|^{\Delta-\widehat{\Delta}}} \cdot \Gamma(\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2) \cdot \left(\frac{|x_\perp|}{2}\right)^{p/2-\widehat{\Delta}} \\ & \cdot \int \frac{d^p \hat{q}}{(2\pi)^p} e^{i\hat{q}\cdot\hat{x}} |\hat{q}|^{p/2-\widehat{\Delta}} \cdot I_{\widehat{\Delta}-p/2}(|x_\perp||\hat{q}|) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{q}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Plugging this into the bulk-defect-defect three-point function using the expression for the partial Fourier transformed three-point functions (see e.g., [FP96, equation (3.41)]):²

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{q}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle &= \int d^p \hat{x} e^{-i\hat{q}\cdot\hat{x}} \langle \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle \\ &= \frac{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2})}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{\Delta_{12}^+-\widehat{\Delta}}} \cdot \frac{2\pi^{p/2}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta}+\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta}+\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2}\right)} \cdot \left(\frac{|\hat{q}|}{2|\hat{y}_{12}|}\right)^{\widehat{\Delta}-p/2} \\ & \cdot \int_0^1 d\xi e^{-i\hat{q}\cdot[\xi\hat{y}_1+(1-\xi)\hat{y}_2]} \cdot \xi^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-+p/2}{2}-1} (1-\xi)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-+p/2}{2}-1} \cdot K_{\widehat{\Delta}-p/2}\left(\sqrt{\xi(1-\xi)}|\hat{q}||\hat{y}_{12}|\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_\Delta(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle &= \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_\Delta, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}) c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2})}{c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}})} \\ & \cdot \frac{2\pi^{p/2}\Gamma(\widehat{\Delta} + 1 - p/2)}{|\hat{y}_{12}|^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^+-p/2} |x_\perp|^{\Delta-p/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta}+\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta}+\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2}\right)} \cdot \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-+p/2}{2}-1} (1-\xi)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-+p/2}{2}-1} \\ & \cdot \int \frac{d^p \hat{q}}{(2\pi)^p} e^{i\hat{q}\cdot[\xi(\hat{x}-\hat{y}_1)+(1-\xi)(\hat{x}-\hat{y}_2)]} \cdot I_{\widehat{\Delta}-p/2}(|x_\perp||\hat{q}|) \cdot K_{\widehat{\Delta}-p/2}\left(\sqrt{\xi(1-\xi)}\cdot|\hat{q}||\hat{y}_{12}|\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

with $K_\mu(x)$ being the modified Bessel function of the second kind. The integral over the whole

¹We have used the standard definition of the modified Bessel function of the first kind $I_\nu(z)$:

$$I_\nu(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu+n+1)n!} \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{\nu+2n}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

²One can readily show this identity by using Schwinger parametrization (A.13) similarly to the half-space integral (A.11) (see e.g., [CCKN19, appendix A.1] for a derivation).

\hat{q} -space reduces to a single integral over $|\hat{q}|$:³

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{d^p \hat{q}}{(2\pi)^p} e^{-i\hat{q}\cdot\hat{x}} \dots &= \text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^{p-2}) \int_0^\infty d|\hat{q}| |\hat{q}|^{p-1} \int_0^\pi d\theta (\sin\theta)^{p-2} e^{-i|\hat{q}||\hat{x}|\cos\theta} \dots \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{x}|^{p/2-1}} \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{d|\hat{q}|}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} |\hat{q}|^{p/2} J_{p/2-1}(|\hat{x}||\hat{q}|) \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Then, the last line of (C.5) turns out to take the form of the triple Bessel integral (see e.g., [Zwi14, equation (6.578.11)]):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty dx x^{\nu+1} K_\mu(ax) I_\mu(bx) J_\nu(cx) &= \frac{\Gamma(\mu+\nu)}{2^{\mu+1} \Gamma(\mu+1)} \cdot \frac{c^\nu}{(ab)^{\nu+1} u^{\mu+\nu+1}} \\ &\cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\mu+\nu+1}{2}, \frac{\mu+\nu+2}{2}; \mu+1; \frac{1}{u^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

with $2abu = a^2 + b^2 + c^2$. Hence, we have:

(The last line of (C.5))

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\widehat{\Delta}) [\xi(1-\xi)]^{-\frac{p/2}{2}}}{2^{\widehat{\Delta}+1} \pi^{p/2} \Gamma(\widehat{\Delta} - p/2 + 1) |x_\perp|^{p/2} |\hat{y}_{12}|^{p/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{u}^{\widehat{\Delta}}} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta}}{2}, \frac{\widehat{\Delta}+1}{2}; \widehat{\Delta} - \frac{p}{2} + 1; \frac{1}{\tilde{u}^2}\right), \quad (\text{C.9})$$

where \tilde{u} is defined by the relation:

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{|x_\perp|^2 + |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_1|^2 \xi + |\hat{x} - \hat{y}_2|^2 (1-\xi)}{2 |x_\perp| |\hat{y}_{12}| \sqrt{\xi(1-\xi)}}. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

To address the remaining ξ -integral in (C.5), we make use of the Mellin–Barnes representation of Gauss’s hypergeometric function:

$${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = \frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)} \cdot \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{ds}{2\pi i} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(a+s)\Gamma(b+s)\Gamma(-s)}{\Gamma(c+s)} (-z)^s. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Combining this with the following formula:

$$\int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{\mu-1}(1-x)^{\nu-1}}{[ax+b(1-x)+c]^{\mu+\nu}} = \frac{\Gamma(\mu)\Gamma(\nu)}{(a+c)^\mu(b+c)^\nu \Gamma(\mu+\nu)}, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

³The symbol $\text{Vol}(\mathbb{S}^n) = 2\pi^{\frac{n+1}{2}}/\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})$ stands for the volume of unit n -sphere. We also used the following formula for the Bessel function of the first kind:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\pi d\theta (\sin\theta)^a e^{-ib\cos\theta} &= \int_0^\pi d\theta (\sin\theta)^a \cos(b\cos\theta) \\ &= \frac{2^{a/2} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\frac{a+1}{2})}{b^{a/2}} \cdot J_{a/2}(b). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

one can complete the ξ -integral to find that:

(The last two lines of (C.5))

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= T_{\Delta}^{\widehat{\Delta}_1, \widehat{\Delta}_2}(x, \hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \cdot v^{\widehat{\Delta}} \\
 &\cdot \frac{\Gamma(\widehat{\Delta} - p/2 + 1)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2}\right)} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{ds}{2\pi i} \cdot \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2} + s\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2} + s\right) \Gamma(-s)}{\Gamma(\widehat{\Delta} - p/2 + s + 1)} \cdot (-v)^s.
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.13}$$

One can identify the integral concerning s with the Mellin–Barnes representation of Gauss’s hypergeometric function (C.11). Putting all together, we end up with the expression for the conformal block expansion of the bulk-defect-defect three-point functions presented in the main text (see the last paragraph of section 3.4).

C.2 Derivation from Casimir equation

We here would like to perform conformal block expansion of the bulk-defect-defect three-point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(\hat{y}_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(\hat{y}_2) \rangle$ by use of the Casimir differential equation and the limiting form of the DOE:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(x) \supset \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s})/c(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, s})}{|x_{\perp}|^{\Delta - \widehat{\Delta} + s}} \cdot x_{\perp}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\perp}^{i_s} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}, i_1 \dots i_s}(\hat{x}) + (\text{subleading in } |x_{\perp}|). \tag{C.14}$$

We start by taking radial quantization origin on the defect such that the unit $(d-1)$ -sphere includes the bulk primary, isolating the rest (see figure C.1).⁴ Thanks to (3.46), we can ignore the contribution of defect primaries with transverse spin indices. We then expand the correlation function by inserting projectors onto conformal multiplets of defect scalar primaries $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\langle \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \rangle \\
 &= \sum_{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \langle \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} | \mathcal{R}\{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2)\} | \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}} | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) | \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(p)} \rangle / \langle \mathcal{D}^{(p)} \rangle.
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.15}$$

The Casimir operator associated with parallel conformal group $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^{AB} \mathbf{J}_{AB}$ acts on defect scalar primaries $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}$ as follows:⁵

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^{AB} \mathbf{J}_{AB} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(Q) &= -Q \bullet \frac{\partial}{\partial Q} \left(p + Q \bullet \frac{\partial}{\partial Q} \right) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(Q) \\
 &= -\widehat{\Delta} (\widehat{\Delta} - p) \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(Q).
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.16}$$

⁴It is always possible to go to this configuration using the defect conformal transformations.

⁵The generators of the parallel conformal group \mathbf{J}_{AB} act on defect scalar primaries as in (3.34). Recall that the homogeneity condition (3.33) implies that $Q \bullet \frac{\partial}{\partial Q} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(Q) = -\widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\widehat{\Delta}}(Q)$.




Figure C.1: Our choice of the radial quantization origin.

Combining this with the state/operator correspondence, we find that the Casimir eigenvalue of the projector is given by:

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^{AB} \mathbf{J}_{AB} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} \rangle = -\hat{\Delta} (\hat{\Delta} - p) | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Let us define the conformal block associated with this bulk-defect-defect three-point function through the relation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \hat{\mathcal{D}} | \mathcal{R} \{ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) | \Omega \rangle \\ &= \frac{b(\mathcal{O}_{\Delta}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}}) c(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_1}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_2}) / c(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}})}{(P \circ P)^{\frac{\hat{\Delta}}{2}} (-2P \bullet Q_1)^{\frac{\hat{\Delta}_{12}}{2}} (-2P \bullet Q_2)^{\frac{\hat{\Delta}_{21}}{2}} (-2Q_1 \bullet Q_2)^{\frac{\hat{\Delta}_{12}^+}{2}}} \cdot G_{\hat{\Delta}}^{\hat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

so that it is subject to the boundary condition required from the leading DOE of \mathcal{O}_{Δ} (C.14):⁶

$$G_{\hat{\Delta}}^{\hat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v) \xrightarrow{v \rightarrow 0} v^{\hat{\Delta}/2}. \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Let us plug the $\text{SO}(1, p+1)$ Casimir $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^{AB} \mathbf{J}_{AB}$ onto the right of $| \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} \rangle$ in (C.18). Then, from (C.17) and (2.70), one finds that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \hat{\mathcal{D}} | \mathcal{R} \{ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} | \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^{AB} \mathbf{J}_{AB} \right) \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) | \Omega \rangle \\ &= -\hat{\Delta} (\hat{\Delta} - p) \langle \hat{\mathcal{D}} | \mathcal{R} \{ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) | \Omega \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{J}_{AB}(P) \mathcal{J}^{AB}(P) \langle \hat{\mathcal{D}} | \mathcal{R} \{ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_1}(Q_1) \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}_2}(Q_2) \} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\hat{\Delta}} | \mathcal{O}_{\Delta}(P) | \Omega \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

⁶Notice that $v \rightarrow 0$ as $|x_{\perp}| \rightarrow 0$.

This equality simplifies into the following expression:⁷

$$\left[\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{J}_{AB}(P) \mathcal{J}^{AB}(P) + \widehat{\Delta} (\widehat{\Delta} - p) \right] \cdot \frac{G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v)}{(-2P \bullet Q_1)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}} (-2P \bullet Q_2)^{\frac{\widehat{\Delta}_{21}^-}{2}}} = 0. \quad (\text{C.21})$$

After doing some calculations, one obtains the following differential equation for the conformal block $G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v)$:⁸

$$\left\{ 4v^2(1-v)\partial_v^2 + [4(1-v) - 2p] v \partial_v + (\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-)^2 v - \widehat{\Delta} (\widehat{\Delta} - p) \right\} \cdot G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v) = 0. \quad (\text{C.22})$$

There are two solutions to (C.22), but the one that favors the boundary condition (C.19) is given by:

$$G_{\widehat{\Delta}}^{\widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}(v) = v^{\widehat{\Delta}/2} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{\Delta} + \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}, \frac{\widehat{\Delta} - \widehat{\Delta}_{12}^-}{2}; \widehat{\Delta} + 1 - \frac{p}{2}; v \right), \quad (\text{C.23})$$

as anticipated.

⁷Be aware that the differential operator $\mathcal{J}_{AB}(P)$ commutes with $P \circ P$ and $(-2Q_1 \bullet Q_2)$.

⁸Recall the explicit form of the defect cross ratio v expressed in terms of embedding space coordinates (3.59).

Bibliography

- [A⁺18] N. Andrei et al., *Boundary and Defect CFT: Open Problems and Applications*, *J. Phys. A* **53** (2020) 453002, [arXiv:1810.05697 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [ACH82] S. Alvarado, M. Campagna, and H. Hopster, *Surface magnetism of Ni(100) near the critical region by spin-polarized electron scattering*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48** (1982) 51–54.
- [ACK⁺22] O. Aharony, G. Cuomo, Z. Komargodski, M. Mezei, and A. Raviv-Moshe, *Phases of Wilson Lines in Conformal Field Theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** (2023) 151601, [arXiv:2211.11775 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [ACK⁺23] ———, *Phases of Wilson lines: conformality and screening*, *JHEP* **12** (2023) 183, [arXiv:2310.00045 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [AE15] M. Ammon and J. Erdmenger, *Gauge/gravity duality: Foundations and applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Aff95] I. Affleck, *Conformal field theory approach to the Kondo effect*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **26** (1995) 1869–1932, [arXiv:cond-mat/9512099](#).
- [AS14] A. Allais and S. Sachdev, *Spectral function of a localized fermion coupled to the Wilson-Fisher conformal field theory*, *Phys. Rev. B* **90** (2014) 035131, [arXiv:1406.3022 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [Bai35] W. Bailey, *Generalized hypergeometric series*, Cambridge tracts in mathematics and mathematical physics, The University Press, 1935. <https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=J7VsAAAAMAAJ>.
- [BCG⁺13] M. Billò, M. Caselle, D. Gaiotto, F. Gliozzi, M. Meineri, and R. Pellegrini, *Line defects in the 3d Ising model*, *JHEP* **07** (2013) 055, [arXiv:1304.4110 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BDPLVR20] C. Behan, L. Di Pietro, E. Lauria, and B. C. Van Rees, *Bootstrapping boundary-localized interactions*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 182, [arXiv:2009.03336 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [BDPLvR21] C. Behan, L. Di Pietro, E. Lauria, and B. C. van Rees, *Bootstrapping boundary-localized interactions II. Minimal models at the boundary*, **JHEP** **03** (2022) 146, [arXiv:2111.04747 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BGLM16] M. Billò, V. Gonçalves, E. Lauria, and M. Meineri, *Defects in conformal field theory*, **JHEP** **04** (2016) 091, [arXiv:1601.02883 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BK15] P. Basu and C. Krishnan, *ϵ -expansions near three dimensions from conformal field theory*, **JHEP** **11** (2015) 040, [arXiv:1506.06616 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BL19] L. Bianchi and M. Lemos, *Superconformal surfaces in four dimensions*, **JHEP** **06** (2020) 056, [arXiv:1911.05082 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BLvV23] J. Barrat, P. Liendo, and P. van Vliet, *Line defect correlators in fermionic CFTs*, [arXiv:2304.13588 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BM77] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, *Critical Behavior of a Semiinfinite System: n Vector Model in the Large n Limit*, **Phys. Rev. Lett.** **38** (1977) 735–738.
- [BM80] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, *Replica theory of quantum spin glasses*, **Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics** **13** (1980) L655.
- [BMMS15] L. Bianchi, M. Meineri, R. C. Myers, and M. Smolkin, *Rényi entropy and conformal defects*, **JHEP** **07** (2016) 076, [arXiv:1511.06713 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [BPH93] B. Burandt, W. Press, and S. Haussühl, *Near-surface x-ray critical scattering from a $\text{NH}_4\text{Br}(1\bar{1}0)$ surface*, **Phys. Rev. Lett.** **71** (1993) 1188–1191.
- [BT77] V. Bargmann and I. T. Todorov, *Spaces of Analytic Functions on a Complex Cone as Carriers for the Symmetric Tensor Representations of $SO(N)$* , **J. Math. Phys.** **18** (1977) 1141–1148.
- [Car84] J. L. Cardy, *Conformal Invariance and Surface Critical Behavior*, **Nucl. Phys. B** **240** (1984) 514–532.
- [CCKN19] H.-Y. Chen, L.-C. Chen, N. Kobayashi, and T. Nishioka, *The gravity dual of Lorentzian OPE blocks*, **JHEP** **04** (2020) 139, [arXiv:1912.04105 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CHO⁺21] A. Chalabi, C. P. Herzog, A. O’Bannon, B. Robinson, and J. Sisti, *Weyl anomalies of four dimensional conformal boundaries and defects*, **JHEP** **02** (2022) 166, [arXiv:2111.14713 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CKM21] G. Cuomo, Z. Komargodski, and M. Mezei, *Localized magnetic field in the $O(N)$ model*, **JHEP** **02** (2022) 134, [arXiv:2112.10634 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CKMRM22] G. Cuomo, Z. Komargodski, M. Mezei, and A. Raviv-Moshe, *Spin impurities, Wilson lines and semiclassics*, **JHEP** **06** (2022) 112, [arXiv:2202.00040 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [CKRM21] G. Cuomo, Z. Komargodski, and A. Raviv-Moshe, *Renormalization Group Flows on Line Defects*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) 021603, [arXiv:2108.01117 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CLL⁺19] S. M. Chester, W. Landry, J. Liu, D. Poland, D. Simmons-Duffin, N. Su, and A. Vichi, *Carving out OPE space and precise $O(2)$ model critical exponents*, *JHEP* **06** (2020) 142, [arXiv:1912.03324 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CLL⁺20] ———, *Bootstrapping Heisenberg magnets and their cubic instability*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 105013, [arXiv:2011.14647 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [CMRM21] G. Cuomo, M. Mezei, and A. Raviv-Moshe, *Boundary conformal field theory at large charge*, *JHEP* **10** (2021) 143, [arXiv:2108.06579 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Col86] J. C. Collins, *Renormalization: An Introduction to Renormalization, The Renormalization Group, and* Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, vol. 26, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [CPPR11] M. S. Costa, J. Penedones, D. Poland, and S. Rychkov, *Spinning Conformal Correlators*, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 071, [arXiv:1107.3554 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [DD81a] H. W. Diehl and S. Dietrich, *Field-theoretical approach to multicritical behavior near free surfaces*, *Phys. Rev. B* **24** (1981) 2878–2880.
- [DD81b] ———, *Field-theoretical approach to static critical phenomena in semi-infinite systems*, *Z. Phys. B* **42** (1981) 65–86.
- [DFMS97] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Senechal, *Conformal Field Theory*, Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [DHPJ91] H. Dosch, T. Höfer, J. Peisl, and R. L. Johnson, *Synchrotron x-ray scattering from the Al(110) surface at the onset of surface melting*, *EPL* **15** (1991) 527–533.
- [Die96] H. W. Diehl, *The Theory of boundary critical phenomena*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **11** (1997) 3503–3523, [arXiv:cond-mat/9610143](#).
- [Dir36] P. A. Dirac, *Wave equations in conformal space*, *Annals Math.* **37** (1936) 429–442.
- [DLP89] J. Dai, R. G. Leigh, and J. Polchinski, *New Connections Between String Theories*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **4** (1989) 2073–2083.
- [DMP⁺77] V. K. Dobrev, G. Mack, V. B. Petkova, S. G. Petrova, and I. T. Todorov, *Harmonic Analysis on the n -Dimensional Lorentz Group and Its Application to Conformal Quantum* Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 63, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1977.
- [DPPT76] V. Dobrev, V. Petkova, S. Petrova, and I. Todorov, *Dynamical Derivation of Vacuum Operator Product Expansion in Euclidean Conformal Quantum Field Theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **13** (1976) 887.

- [DS20] P. Dey and A. Söderberg, *On analytic bootstrap for interface and boundary CFT*, **JHEP** **07** (2021) 013, [arXiv:2012.11344 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [E⁺20] S. Ebadi et al., *Quantum phases of matter on a 256-atom programmable quantum simulator*, **Nature** **595** (2021) 227–232, [arXiv:2012.12281 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [FAS21] A. Faraji Astaneh and S. N. Solodukhin, *Boundary conformal invariants and the conformal anomaly in five dimensions*, **Phys. Lett. B** **816** (2021) 136282, [arXiv:2102.07661 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [FGG71] S. Ferrara, A. F. Grillo, and R. Gatto, *Manifestly conformal covariant operator-product expansion*, **Lett. Nuovo Cim.** **2S2** (1971) 1363–1369.
- [FGG73] ———, *Tensor representations of conformal algebra and conformally covariant operator product expansion*, **Annals Phys.** **76** (1973) 161–188.
- [FGP72] S. Ferrara, A. Grillo, and G. Parisi, *Nonequivalence between conformal covariant Wilson expansion in Euclidean and Minkowski space*, **Lett. Nuovo Cim.** **5S2** (1972) 147–151.
- [FGPG72] S. Ferrara, A. F. Grillo, G. Parisi, and R. Gatto, *The shadow operator formalism for conformal algebra. Vacuum expectation values and operator products*, **Lett. Nuovo Cim.** **4S2** (1972) 115–120.
- [FKN17] M. Fukuda, N. Kobayashi, and T. Nishioka, *Operator product expansion for conformal defects*, **JHEP** **01** (2018) 013, [arXiv:1710.11165 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [FP96] E. Fradkin and M. Palchik, *Conformal quantum field theory in D-dimensions*, Springer Dordrecht, 1996.
- [Gad16] A. Gadde, *Conformal constraints on defects*, **JHEP** **01** (2020) 038, [arXiv:1602.06354 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GGJN15] S. Ghosh, R. K. Gupta, K. Jaswin, and A. A. Nizami, *ϵ -Expansion in the Gross-Neveu model from conformal field theory*, **JHEP** **03** (2016) 174, [arXiv:1510.04887 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GGLLvV22] A. Gimenez-Grau, E. Lauria, P. Liendo, and P. van Vliet, *Bootstrapping line defects with $O(2)$ global symmetry*, **JHEP** **11** (2022) 018, [arXiv:2208.11715 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GHK22] S. Giombi, E. Helfenberger, and H. Khanchandani, *Line defects in fermionic CFTs*, **JHEP** **08** (2023) 224, [arXiv:2211.11073 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GK16] S. Giombi and V. Kirilin, *Anomalous dimensions in CFT with weakly broken higher spin symmetry*, **JHEP** **11** (2016) 068, [arXiv:1601.01310 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [GK18a] S. Giombi and S. Komatsu, *Exact Correlators on the Wilson Loop in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM: Localization, Defect CFT, and Integrability*, **JHEP** **05** (2018) 109, [arXiv:1802.05201 \[hep-th\]](#). [Erratum: JHEP 11, 123 (2018)].
- [GK18b] ———, *More Exact Results in the Wilson Loop Defect CFT: Bulk-Defect OPE, Nonplanar Corrections and Quantum Spectral Curve*, **J. Phys. A** **52** (2019) 125401, [arXiv:1811.02369 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GK20] S. Giombi and H. Khanchandani, *CFT in AdS and boundary RG flows*, **JHEP** **11** (2020) 118, [arXiv:2007.04955 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GKS17] S. Giombi, V. Kirilin, and E. Skvortsov, *Notes on Spinning Operators in Fermionic CFT*, **JHEP** **05** (2017) 041, [arXiv:1701.06997 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GL23] S. Giombi and B. Liu, *Notes on a surface defect in the $O(N)$ model*, **JHEP** **12** (2023) 004, [arXiv:2305.11402 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GMP13] D. Gaiotto, D. Mazac, and M. F. Paulos, *Bootstrapping the 3d Ising twist defect*, **JHEP** **03** (2014) 100, [arXiv:1310.5078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Haa92] R. Haag, *Local quantum physics: Fields, particles, algebras*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1992.
- [Hen22] J. Henriksson, *The critical $O(N)$ CFT: Methods and conformal data*, **Phys. Rept.** **1002** (2023) 1–72, [arXiv:2201.09520 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Her21] C. P. Herzog, *Conformal Field Theory with Boundaries and Defects*, 2021. <https://www.ggi.infn.it/laces/LACES21/CFTdefects21.html>. Lectures at LACES2021 (videos available on youtube).
- [HH17] C. P. Herzog and K.-W. Huang, *Boundary Conformal Field Theory and a Boundary Central Charge*, **JHEP** **10** (2017) 189, [arXiv:1707.06224 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HHJ15] C. P. Herzog, K.-W. Huang, and K. Jensen, *Universal Entanglement and Boundary Geometry in Conformal Field Theory*, **JHEP** **01** (2016) 162, [arXiv:1510.00021 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HHJ17] C. Herzog, K.-W. Huang, and K. Jensen, *Displacement Operators and Constraints on Boundary Central Charges*, **Phys. Rev. Lett.** **120** (2018) 021601, [arXiv:1709.07431 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HHZ23a] L. Hu, Y.-C. He, and W. Zhu, *Operator Product Expansion Coefficients of the 3D Ising Criticality via Quantum Fuzzy Spheres*, **Phys. Rev. Lett.** **131** (2023) 031601, [arXiv:2303.08844 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [HHZ23b] ———, *Solving Conformal Defects in 3D Conformal Field Theory using Fuzzy Sphere Regularization*, [arXiv:2308.01903 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).

- [HHZ23c] C. Han, L. Hu, and W. Zhu, *Conformal Operator Content of the Wilson-Fisher Transition on Fuzzy Sphere Bilayers*, [arXiv:2312.04047 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [HHZH23] C. Han, L. Hu, W. Zhu, and Y.-C. He, *Conformal four-point correlators of the three-dimensional Ising transition via the quantum fuzzy sphere*, *Phys. Rev. B* **108** (2023) 235123, [arXiv:2306.04681 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [Hor89] P. Horava, *Background Duality of Open String Models*, *Phys. Lett. B* **231** (1989) 251–257.
- [HS22a] C. P. Herzog and A. Shrestha, *Conformal surface defects in Maxwell theory are trivial*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 282, [arXiv:2202.09180 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HS22b] C. P. Herzog and V. Schaub, *Fermions in boundary conformal field theory: crossing symmetry and ϵ -expansion*, *JHEP* **02** (2023) 129, [arXiv:2209.05511 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HVF01] H. Kleinert and V. Schulte-Frohlinde, *Critical properties of ϕ^4 -theories*, World Scientific, 2001.
- [JO15] K. Jensen and A. O’Bannon, *Constraint on Defect and Boundary Renormalization Group Flows*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 091601, [arXiv:1509.02160 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [JORR18] K. Jensen, A. O’Bannon, B. Robinson, and R. Rodgers, *From the Weyl Anomaly to Entropy of Two-Dimensional Boundaries and Defects*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 241602, [arXiv:1812.08745 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Kap05] A. Kapustin, *Wilson-’t Hooft operators in four-dimensional gauge theories and S-duality*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 025005, [arXiv:hep-th/0501015](#).
- [Kar07] M. Kardar, *Statistical physics of fields*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [KKSDZ19] M. Kologlu, P. Kravchuk, D. Simmons-Duffin, and A. Zhiboedov, *Shocks, Superconvergence, and a Stringy Equivalence Principle*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 096, [arXiv:1904.05905 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [KNSW18] N. Kobayashi, T. Nishioka, Y. Sato, and K. Watanabe, *Towards a C-theorem in defect CFT*, *JHEP* **01** (2019) 039, [arXiv:1810.06995 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Kon64] J. Kondo, *Resistance Minimum in Dilute Magnetic Alloys*, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **32** (1964) 37–49.
- [KS18] A. Karch and Y. Sato, *Conformal Manifolds with Boundaries or Defects*, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 156, [arXiv:1805.10427 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [LLMS17] M. Lemos, P. Liendo, M. Meineri, and S. Sarkar, *Universality at large transverse spin in defect CFT*, *JHEP* **09** (2018) 091, [arXiv:1712.08185 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [LLVRZ20] E. Lauria, P. Liendo, B. C. Van Rees, and X. Zhao, *Line and surface defects for the free scalar field*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 060, [arXiv:2005.02413 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [LM75] M. Luscher and G. Mack, *Global Conformal Invariance in Quantum Field Theory*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **41** (1975) 203–234.
- [LMvR23] E. Lauria, M. Milam, and B. C. van Rees, *Perturbative RG flows in AdS: an étude*, [arXiv:2309.10031 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [LNS⁺03] J. Lipa, J. Nissen, D. Stricker, D. Swanson, and T. Chui, *Specific heat of liquid helium in zero gravity very near the lambda point*, *Physical Review B* **68** (2003) 174518.
- [LRvR12] P. Liendo, L. Rastelli, and B. C. van Rees, *The Bootstrap Program for Boundary CFT_d*, *JHEP* **07** (2013) 113, [arXiv:1210.4258 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Luk69] Y. Luke, *The special functions and their approximations*, Mathematics in Science and Engineering, no. volume 2, Academic Press, 1969. <https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=LiC3xQEACAAJ>.
- [Mac77a] G. Mack, *All unitary ray representations of the conformal group SU(2,2) with positive energy*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55** (1977) 1.
- [Mac77b] ———, *Duality in quantum field theory*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **118** (1977) 445–457.
- [Met20] M. A. Metlitski, *Boundary criticality of the O(N) model in d = 3 critically revisited*, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2022) 131, [arXiv:2009.05119 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [Min97] S. Minwalla, *Restrictions imposed by superconformal invariance on quantum field theories*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 783–851, [arXiv:hep-th/9712074](#).
- [MO93] D. M. McAvity and H. Osborn, *Energy momentum tensor in conformal field theories near a boundary*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **406** (1993) 655–680, [arXiv:hep-th/9302068](#).
- [MO95] ———, *Conformal field theories near a boundary in general dimensions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **455** (1995) 522–576, [arXiv:cond-mat/9505127](#).
- [MS69] G. Mack and A. Salam, *Finite component field representations of the conformal group*, *Annals Phys.* **53** (1969) 174–202.
- [Nak13] Y. Nakayama, *Scale invariance vs conformal invariance*, *Phys. Rept.* **569** (2015) 1–93, [arXiv:1302.0884 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [Nii16] K. Nii, *Classical equation of motion and Anomalous dimensions at leading order*, **JHEP** **07** (2016) 107, [arXiv:1605.08868 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [NOS22a] T. Nishioka, Y. Okuyama, and S. Shimamori, *The epsilon expansion of the $O(N)$ model with line defect from conformal field theory*, **JHEP** **03** (2023) 203, [arXiv:2212.04076 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [NOS22b] ———, *Comments on epsilon expansion of the $O(N)$ model with boundary*, **JHEP** **03** (2023) 051, [arXiv:2212.04078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Ons44] L. Onsager, *Crystal statistics. I. A Two-dimensional model with an order disorder transition*, **Phys. Rev.** **65** (1944) 117–149.
- [OP93] H. Osborn and A. C. Petkou, *Implications of conformal invariance in field theories for general dimensions*, **Annals Phys.** **231** (1994) 311–362, [arXiv:hep-th/9307010](#).
- [OS73] K. Osterwalder and R. Schrader, *Axioms for Euclidean Green's Functions*, **Commun. Math. Phys.** **31** (1973) 83–112.
- [OS75] ———, *Axioms for Euclidean Green's Functions. 2.*, **Commun. Math. Phys.** **42** (1975) 281.
- [PKM⁺21] J. Padayasi, A. Krishnan, M. A. Metlitski, I. A. Gruzberg, and M. Meineri, *The extraordinary boundary transition in the 3d $O(N)$ model via conformal bootstrap*, **SciPost Phys.** **12** (2022) 190, [arXiv:2111.03071 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [Pol70] A. M. Polyakov, *Conformal symmetry of critical fluctuations*, **JETP Lett.** **12** (1970) 381–383.
- [Pol74] A. M. Polyakov, *Nonhamiltonian approach to conformal quantum field theory*, **Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.** **66** (1974) 23–42.
- [Pol88] J. Polchinski, *Scale and Conformal Invariance in Quantum Field Theory*, **Nucl. Phys. B** **303** (1988) 226–236.
- [Pol07] J. Polchinski, *String theory. Vol. 1: An introduction to the bosonic string*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, 12 2007.
- [PRV18] D. Poland, S. Rychkov, and A. Vichi, *The Conformal Bootstrap: Theory, Numerical Techniques, and Applications*, **Rev. Mod. Phys.** **91** (2019) 015002, [arXiv:1805.04405 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [PS95] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to quantum field theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, USA, 1995.

- [PTAW17] F. Parisen Toldin, F. F. Assaad, and S. Wessel, *Critical behavior in the presence of an order-parameter pinning field*, *Phys. Rev. B* **95** (2017) 014401.
- [Raj15] A. Raju, *ϵ -Expansion in the Gross-Neveu CFT*, *JHEP* **10** (2016) 097, [arXiv:1510.05287 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [RG80] J. S. Reeve and A. J. Guttmann, *Critical behavior of the n -vector model with a free surface*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** (1980) 1581–1583.
- [RRTV08] R. Rattazzi, V. S. Rychkov, E. Tonni, and A. Vichi, *Bounding scalar operator dimensions in 4D CFT*, *JHEP* **12** (2008) 031, [arXiv:0807.0004 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [RT15] S. Rychkov and Z. M. Tan, *The ϵ -expansion from conformal field theory*, *J. Phys. A* **48** (2015) 29FT01, [arXiv:1505.00963 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Ryc16] S. Rychkov, *EPFL Lectures on Conformal Field Theory in $D \geq 3$ Dimensions*, SpringerBriefs in Physics, 2016. [arXiv:1601.05000 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [SD16] D. Simmons-Duffin, *The Conformal Bootstrap*, Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics: New Frontiers in Fields and Strings, 2017, pp. 1–74. [arXiv:1602.07982 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [SF86] L. Sigl and W. Fenzl, *Order-parameter exponent β_1 of a binary liquid mixture at a boundary*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 2191–2194.
- [Smi07] S. Smirnov, *Conformal invariance in random cluster models. i. holomorphic fermions in the ising model*, 2007. [arXiv:0708.0039 \[math-ph\]](#).
- [Söd17] A. Söderberg, *Anomalous Dimensions in the WF $O(N)$ Model with a Monodromy Line Defect*, *JHEP* **03** (2018) 058, [arXiv:1706.02414 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [SR23] A. Söderberg Rousu, *The $O(N)$ -flavoured replica twist defect*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 022, [arXiv:2304.08116 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [SW89] R. Streater and A. Wightman, *PCT, spin and statistics, and all that*, Princeton University Press, 1989.
- [tH78] G. 't Hooft, *On the Phase Transition Towards Permanent Quark Confinement*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **138** (1978) 1–25.
- [Tol23] F. P. Toldin, *The ordinary surface universality class of the three-dimensional $O(N)$ model*, *Phys. Rev. B* **108** (2023) L020404, [arXiv:2303.16683 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [Tre23] M. Trepanier, *Surface defects in the $O(N)$ model*, *JHEP* **09** (2023) 074, [arXiv:2305.10486 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Wan21] Y. Wang, *Defect a -theorem and a -maximization*, *JHEP* **02** (2022) 061, [arXiv:2101.12648 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [Wei10] S. Weinberg, *Six-dimensional Methods for Four-dimensional Conformal Field Theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 045031, [arXiv:1006.3480 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [WF72] K. G. Wilson and M. E. Fisher, *Critical exponents in 3.99 dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28** (1972) 240–243.
- [Wil74] K. G. Wilson, *Confinement of Quarks*, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 2445–2459.
- [Wil75] ———, *The Renormalization Group: Critical Phenomena and the Kondo Problem*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **47** (1975) 773.
- [WK74] K. Wilson and J. B. Kogut, *The Renormalization group and the epsilon expansion*, *Phys. Rept.* **12** (1974) 75–199.
- [Yam16] S. Yamaguchi, *The ϵ -expansion of the codimension two twist defect from conformal field theory*, *PTEP* **2016** (2016) 091B01, [arXiv:1607.05551 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Zam86] A. Zamolodchikov, *Irreversibility of the Flux of the Renormalization Group in a 2D Field Theory*, *JETP Lett.* **43** (1986) 730–732.
- [ZHH⁺22] W. Zhu, C. Han, E. Huffman, J. S. Hofmann, and Y.-C. He, *Uncovering Conformal Symmetry in the 3D Ising Transition: State-Operator Correspondence from a Quantum Fuzzy Sphere Regularization*, *Phys. Rev. X* **13** (2023) 021009, [arXiv:2210.13482 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [Zwi14] D. Zwillinger, *Table of integrals, series, and products*, Elsevier Science, 2014.